DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 757 IR 007 374

AUTHOR Etaix, Mireille; Lenglet, Frans
TITLE "Tele Pour Tous" in Rural Ivory Coast: Audience, Impact, Perceptions: Report of Two Surveys Conducted in January and April, 1977.
INSTITUTION Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C.; Stanford Univ., Calif. Inst. for Communication Research.
SPONS AGENCY Agency for International Development (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 77
CONTRACT AID/afr-C-1158
NOTE 255p.; For related documents, see IR 007 325, IR 007 333-334, IR 007 339, IR 007 347, IR 007 349, IR 007 363, IR 007 368, IR 007 370, IR 007 375, and IR 007 377 ; Appendices may be marginally legible; Appendix A in French

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Broadcast Television; Community Attitudes; Developing Nations; Educational Development; *Educational Television; Instructional Programs; *Nonformal Education; Program Attitudes; *Rural Education; *Socioeconomic Influences; Socioeconomic Status; Technological Advancement; Television Surveys; *Television Viewing; Viewing Time
IDENTIFIERS *Ivory Coast

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of two surveys conducted in January and April 1977 in the Ivory Coast to assess the impact of the "Tele Pour Tous" programs on rural audiences in terms of awareness, learning, and action. Descriptions of the socio-economic characteristics of the audience and their viewing patterns were sought, and attempts were made to determine the attitudes of the audience concerning "Tele Pour Tous" and to explore opinions about the benefits and beneficiaries of the programs. Eight conclusions drawn suggest that the Ivorian Out-of-School Educational Television project works, though minimally and inefficiently--however the reach and effect of the programs could be improved by modifying their form, content and reception. Appendices include the questionnaires (in French), statistical data, and a list of programs broadcast. (JEG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

R

ED172757

AED

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.
a nonprofit planning organization

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"Tele Pour Tous" in Rural Ivory Coast: Audience, Impact, Perceptions

Report of Two Surveys Conducted in January and April, 1977

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Everett M. Rogers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

by

Mireille Etaix

Frans Lenglet

November, 1977

I2001374

This report has been prepared by the Academy for Educational Development and the Stanford University Institute for Communication Research for the Agency for International Development, Bureau for Africa, Office of Africa Regional Affairs under Contract No. AID/afr-C-1158.

WASHINGTON OFFICE: 1414 TWENTY-SECOND STREET N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037 (202) 293-5960

SUMMARY

This report presents and discusses the largely quantitative results of two surveys conducted in January and April 1977 in the Ivory Coast.

In Chapter I, the three main research objectives are explained. First we wanted to asses the impact of the Télé Pour Tous programs (hereafter called TPT) especially on the rural audience. These TV programs are produced and broadcast by the Out-of-School Educational Department of the Ivorian Ministry of Primary and Television Education. Their impact was defined in terms of awareness (sensibilisation), learning and action. Secondly, we wanted to obtain reliable information about the socio-economic characteristics of the TPT audience and their viewing patterns. Thirdly, we wanted to determine the attitudes of the TPT audience concerning TPT programs and to explore their opinions about the benefits and beneficiaries of the programs. In order to develop these research objectives an overview is provided of the principal findings and conclusions of previous research dealing with the operation and effects of the TPT project. These findings point to the limited reach and effectiveness of the TPT programs. There remains disagreement, however, on a number of aspects of the entire TPT operation and the functioning of the TV in the village context, a disagreement the present report tries to reconcile.

In Chapter II we explain why the original quasi-experimental research design was abandoned, what sample procedure was utilized and how the actual field surveys were carried out. Twenty-two villages spread over the three major climatic zones of the country were selected. Sixteen villages had a primary school with TV reception, 6 did not. The latter were to serve as a "comparison group", when measuring the impact of two TV series on animal

husbandry and vaccination. These TPT programs were scheduled in the period in between the two surveys. Unfortunately, the vaccination series was never broadcast. Stratified quota-sampling with sex, age and TV watching as main quota criteria was used to select about 30 individual respondents in the TV villages and 20 in the non-TV villages in January as well as in April 1977. Individual questionnaires measuring the different aspects of the research objectives were administered by a total of 18 researchers, who had different amounts of research training. Other questionnaires dealing with the general village context, village development problems, TPT watching, and modern livestock raising activities were administered to the village chiefs, the school directors and TPT animators, and the agents of the SODEPRA (the government livestock agency).

In order to provide a general context for the interpretation of the research results, Chapter III gives a description of the characteristics of the sample villages and the individual respondents. The picture that emerges in the first part shows that objectively and subjectively most of the villages experience severe development problems, as illustrated by the absence of health facilities, safe water supplies and decent housing. TV villages do not differ very much from non-TV villages. The latter are characterized by more difficult accessibility than the former, in terms of proximity to a town and road conditions. It also appears that the development problems are of a structural nature, and that the TPT programs cannot be expected to significantly alter these conditions. The second part of Chapter III describes the differences between the theoretical sample distribution and the distribution of the January and April samples with respect to a number of independent variables such as sex, age, religion, social status, education

and income, which, in later chapters, are related to certain dependent variables such as TV or TPT watching, TPT recall and impact and perceptions of TPT benefits. Particular attention is devoted to the variable "individual income" and its measurement. We indicate that the commonly used income measures are crude and sometimes inappropriate. Therefore we are convinced of the necessity to improve the theory and measurement of cash income in the African context.

The central issue of TV and TPT watching and of the audiences of both general TV and particular TPT programs is discussed in Chapters IV and V. Chapter IV deals with the general TV watching, while Chapter V concentrates on the characteristics and habits of the TPT spectators. It is observed that even in villages without a TV school there are people who watch TV - though irregularly - mostly while they pay a visit to relatives in the urban areas. As far as TV and TPT in TV villages is concerned, the data suggest the following:

(1) Only a limited proportion of the rural adult population - the main target audience of the TPT programs - has access to a TV receiver. At present only about 1,300 villages out of an estimated total of 8,000 villages have a primary school equipped with TV sets. Private TV ownership remains the exception in the rural areas.

(2) In the best of all situations only 10 percent of the potential rural TPT audience is exposed to the TPT programs.

(3) A considerable number of TV/TPT spectators are likely to be more interested in the general TV programs than in the TPT programs.

(4) A certain number of TV schools open their doors also on other evenings than on the two TPT evenings alone, thus attracting more spectators for the regular TV programs.

(5) In one way or another the various socio-economic and cultural groups are represented among the TV/TPT spectators. The large majority of them are younger men, without much cash income and without any formal schooling. However, some socio-economic groups are more prone to watch TV/TPT than others: Young men who fall in the higher income brackets and with some formal education show a tendency to attend in greater numbers than their total weight in the village population would suggest.

(6) The TV/TPT spectators are characterized by the irregularity of their viewing habits. They form an "open" audience without a core or leader. The term "viewing group" is inappropriate because there is no significant regular audience.

(7) Even if village schools are opened for TPT, only in a few cases does adequate animation take place.

(8) Animation sessions are characterized by a formal primary school pedagogy which does not prepare for or induce to collective decision-making and action.

This last point forms a partial explanation for the lack of impact discussed in Chapter VI. The survey data indicate that among the small number of TPT spectators some sensitization impact can be discussed. We find that most of the spectators remember clearly the TPT programs on "agriculture" and "water". The prescriptions of the TPT programs on "credit and saving" are the best retained. The Water Series programs were integrated into a national campaign and dealt with issues of primordial importance to the village population. The various programs on "agriculture" have the same relevance but are shorter series and do not form parts of on-going campaigns. The "credit and savings" programs had a very attractive form and were repeated several times. These programs illustrate the characteristics of "successful"

TPT programs: (1) relevancy for the potential audience; (2) attractive form with which the spectator can identify, and (3) a large number of broadcasts and/or reruns in a more or less sequential order.

In contrast to the attainment of the sensitization objective the TPT action objective is not reached. Data show that there are few accomplished actions resulting from watching and discussing the TPT programs. It is clear that few actions have been started. The little "action impact" there is remains on the level of "decisions" and "intentions."

Chapter VII discusses the fact that almost all the TV/TPT spectators perceive television as a truthful medium, which according to half the respondents deals with important village development problems. This positive attitude is emphasized by the rather general opinion that TV serves the purpose of instruction and not only entertainment. For half the respondents this "instruction" consists of "learning to live like those in the city". Especially the young male spectators are perceived to be the prime beneficiairies of the TPT programs. These and other elements indicate that the outside "modern" world is not immediately regarded with suspicion but is considered to be of value for the whole village.

In the final Chapter we conclude that the Ivorian Out-of-School Educational Televison project works, though minimally and inefficiently. The reach and effect of the TPT programs could be improved by modifying their form, content and reception. This conclusion provides the basis for some explanations why the system does not operate as it is supposed to, and for recommendations to increase its effectiveness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Summary		Sum i
Table of Contents		i
Introduction		Intro. i
Chapter I	Survey Objectives and Results of Previous Research	1
	1. The principal survey objectives	1
	2. Results of previous research	3
Chapter II	Research Methodology and Field Surveys	18
	1. Introduction	18
	2. The original research design	19
	3. Sampling design	22
	4. The instruments	29
	5. The surveys	39
	6. Conclusion	52
Chapter III	Characteristics of Sample Villages and Respondents	56
	1. Introduction	56
	2. The sample villages	57
	3. The individual respondents	68
	4. Conclusion	80
Chapter IV	TV Watching in TV and Non-TV Villages	83
	1. Introduction	83
	2. TV watching in TV villages	84
	3. TV audience characteristics	91

Table of Contents (Continued)

		Page
	4. TV watching in non-TV villages	104
	5. Conclusion	111
Chapter V	TPT Watching in TV Villages	115
	1. Introduction	115
	2. TPT audience characteristics	116
	3. TPT watching	122
	4. Size of TPT audience	134
Chapter VI	TPT Impact	144
	1. The effect of TPT : actions claimed	144
	2. Memory impact	150
	3. General conclusion	158
Chapter VII	Perception of TPT and Perceived TPT Benefits and Beneficiaries	160
	1. Introduction	160
	2. TPT's truthfulness	160
	3. TPT's training purpose	161
	4. Perceived TPT beneficiaries	162
	5. Perceived TPT benefits	170
Chapter VIII	Conclusions and Recommendations	184
	1. Conclusions	184
	2. Recommendations	186

Table of Contents (Continued)

		Page
Appendices		
Appendix A	Individual questionnaire, January 1977	Appendix A - 1
Appendix B	Individual questionnaire, April 1977	Appendix B - 1
Appendix C	Broadcasting dates and titles of TPT series on animal husbandry	Appendix C - 1
Appendix D	List of villages included in the sample	Appendix D - 1 - 2
Appendix E	The presence of infrastructural innovations in the 22 sample villages	Appendix E - 1
Appendix F	The initiators and financers of infrastructural innovations in TV and non-TV villages	Appendix F - 1 - 2
Appendix G	The most urgent development problems in the 22 sample villages	Appendix G - 1
Appendix H	Total number and kind of field agents in the 22 sample villages	Appendix H - 1
Appendix I	Distribution of ethnic groups in the sample villages	Appendix I - 1
Appendix J	List of main village development programs as perceived by the individual respondents (Question 42, April)	Appendix J - 1
Appendix K	List of TPT programs broadcast in 1976-77	Appendix K - 1 - 3
Appendix L	List of abbreviations	Appendix L - 1 - 2
Appendix M	List of research reports dealing with the operation and impact of the Télé Pour Tous programs	Appendix M - 1 - 3

Table of Contents (Continued)

List of Tables

		Page
Table 2-1	Sample quotas in TV and non-TV villages	28
Table 3-1	The total number of respondents in the theoretical sample, in the January and April surveys, and among the April absentees in TV and non-TV villages	70
Table 3-2	Distribution of TV village respondents in the theoretical sample and the January and April surveys according to sex, TV watching and age (N = 480)	70
Table 3-3	Distribution of non-TV village respondents in the theoretical sample and the January and April surveys according to sex, TV watching and age (N = 120)	71
Table 3-4	Distribution of respondents' professions in TV and non-TV villages in January	73
Table 3-5	Annual income distribution of respondents in January and April	76
Table 3-6	Distribution of April absentees according to sex, TV watching and age	79
Table 4-1	"Do you watch television?" (January) and "Have you watched television since January?" (April)	84
Table 4-2	Frequency of TV watching in January and April	86
Table 4-3	"What kind of TV programs do you watch?"	87

Table of Contents (Continued)

		Page
Table 4-4	"What days of the week do you watch TV?"	90
Table 4-5	Distribution of TV and non-TV spectators in January and April, according to sex	94
Table 4-6	Distribution of TV and non-TV spectators in January and April, according to age	95
Table 4-7	Relative frequency of TV spectators of 6 ethnic groups	97
Table 4-8	Distribution of TV spectators and non-spectators in January and April, according to profession	98
Table 4-9	Distribution of January TV spectators and non-spectators according to income	99
Table 4-10	Distribution of January TV spectators and non-spectators according to educational level	100
Table 4-11	"Where do you watch TV?"	106
Table 4-12	"On what days do you watch TV?"	108
Table 5-1	Distribution of TV villagers and TPT spectators according to ethnic groups	118
Table 5-2	Distribution of TV villagers and TPT spectators according to profession	119
Table 5-3	Distribution of TPT spectators and non-spectators in January and April, according to annual income	120
Table 5-4	Distribution of TV villagers and TPT spectators according to annual income	121

Table of Contents (Continued)

		Page
Table 5-5	Distribution of January TPT spectators and non-spectators according to education	122
Table 5-6	Number of TPT spectators among TV spectators in January and April	123
Table 5-7	"Do you know in advance the subject of each TPT broadcast?"	128
Table 5-8	By what means do you know in advance the subject of each TPT broadcast?"	129
Table 5-9	"Since January, what happens immediately after the TPT broadcasts?"	131
Table 5-10	"Do you talk during these discussions very often, sometimes or never?"	132
Table 5-11	Number of TPT spectators who think that TV serves the purpose of instruction and/or entertainment	133
Table 5-12	National TPT audience figures for the years 1973-77	135
Table 6-1	Retention of TPT subject areas in January and April	152
Table 6-2	TPT program subjects 1973-1974	153
Table 7-1	Perceived "minority" beneficiaries of TPT	163
Table 7-2	Forced choice beneficiaries of TPT	165-166
Table 7-3	Reasons why the young are perceived as beneficiaries of TPT	169

Table of Contents (Continued)

		Page
Table 7-4	The "urban" influence of TPT	172
Table 7-5	Aspects of city living associated with TPT lessons	173
Table 7-6	Aspects of city living as a model of attractive living	174
Table 7-7	Aspects of city living associated with material benefits	175
Table 7-8	Aspects of city living associated with wealth	176
Table 7-9	Village problems dealt with by TPT according to January TPT spectators	179
Table 7-10	Village problems not shown on TV according to April TV spectators	180
Bibliographic References		Biblio 1

INTRODUCTION

This report contains the methodology, the results and the conclusions of two surveys undertaken in January and April 1977 in 22 villages among 600 respondents in the Ivory Coast. It is one of the last reports resulting from an effort to evaluate the operation and impact of the Ivorian Out-of-School Education Project, started in 1973*.

The major objective of the 1977 surveys was to determine the impact of the Télé pour Tous TV programs for rural adults by means of individual interviews instead of using other research techniques adopted in previous research and reported in Benveniste (1977), Grant and Seya (1976) and Lenglet (1976). But there were other research objectives dealing with the TPT audience and its perceptions of the TPT programs.

The rather voluminous size of the report is due to the fact that there are various potential audiences with different interests. In the first place, there is the Government of the Ivory Coast; The Ministry of Primary Education and Educational Television and the Out-of-School Education Department of this Ministry want to know about the overall effectiveness of the Télé pour Tous and about the elements that need improvements and modification. The second audience group consists of the U. S. Agency for International Development which sponsored the present research, and of other international agencies. Their interests lie not only in the overall performance of the project but also in the assessment to what extent similar operations could be effectively launched elsewhere. The third audience group

---

*These reports are included in Appendix M.

comprises the Evaluation Service of the Ivorian Ministry of Primary Education and Educational Televison, the Academy for Educational Development, Inc., and the Institute for Communication Research of Stanford University who in one way or another were closely involved in the execution of the out-of-school education evaluation contract. They as well as other research institutions are, of course, also interested in the final results and conclusions of the evaluation research but they need to know too about the methodology, research decisions and survey conditions in order to enlarge their knowledge and experience with field research in an African context and to improve future research projects.

Had this report been written for only one of the audience groups mentioned, it could have been shorter and could have concentrated on the particular interests of the specific readers. Because there are different potential readers we were obliged to go into details in each section.

Therefore the reader only interested in the research conclusions and recommendations is referred to Chapter VIII. Those readers who want to know in more detail about the research results should also read Chapters IV, V, VI and VII. The characteristics of the general TV and the Télé pour Tous audience and their viewing habits are discussed in Chapters IV and V. The impact of the Télé pour Tous programs in Chapter VI, and the audience perceptions of the Télé pour Tous programs and their potential benefits in Chapter VII.

For those readers interested in the methdology of organizing the field surveys, Chapter II is of importance.

In order to gain a better understanding of any of these chapters the reader is advised to read also Chapter I in which the objectives of the surveys are formulated and the link between these surveys and previous research is made.

Due to factors discussed in the first chapters of the report the findings cannot on a strict statistical basis be generalized to the whole country. We are, however, confident that the results reported provide a realistic image of the operation and effects of the Télé pour Tous broadcasts, the attractiveness and effectiveness of which seem to be declining over the last year.

The field research was carried out by Mireille Etaix, Lamine Gbato, Gnohité Okoubi Blaise, Stephen Grant, Konan Kouadio Grégoire, Etien Kouramani, Frans Lenglet, Yao N'Goran, Lisa N'Diaye, Tanoh Ouassa, Pierre Thizier Seya, Joseph Yao and Faustin Kouadjo Yao of the Service d'Evaluation, Abidjan, and the following nine ACRIS: Abokan Pierre, Assi Mambo Léon, Diop Mamadou Moustapha, Fé Gaston, Koffi Loukou Luc, Kouassi Dibi Mathurin, Sarka Fako Georges, Touman Koffi, and Yelakan Koné Norbert. Coding of the interview data was done by many of the same researchers, and coding advice was given by John Broadhurst of the Service Autonome des Etudes Générales de la Planification et de la Statistique of the Ministry of Education, Abidjan. Basic statistical computer analyses were performed using the SPSS program.* Computer advice was received from Robert Hornik and Peter Spain of the Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University. Graphics were done by Jean Ahou, Service d'Evaluation, Abidjan. Emile McAnany of the Institute for Communication Research was the research supervisor.

The survey results could only be obtained thanks to the valuable collaboration of those mentioned above and to the many Sub-Prefects, Primary School Inspectors, primary school directors and teachers, and the chiefs and inhabitants of the 22 villages where we worked.

Mireille Etaix
Frans Lenglet

November, 1977

* Nie, Norman, et al. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975 (second edition).

CHAPTER I

SURVEY OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH

1.1. The principal survey objectives

In the past two years the Evaluation Service has undertaken several studies to assess the process and the effects of the Télé pour Tous TV programs, hereafter called TPT. The results of this research have been published in a number of reports[1]. The conditions under which these studies were carried out constrained their scope and depth, and it was decided that a major effort should be made to increase the understanding of the operations and the impact of the TPT programs. We were particularly interested in the impact among the rural population, mainly because the so-called "rural mass" is, according to official TPT documents, the prime target group of the TPT programs.

Once or twice a week, after the evening news, the Télé pour Tous or TV for Everybody programs are broadcast. Aimed at the out-of-school audience group of mainly illiterate adults and youth in the rural as well as urban areas they carry information related to such diverse issues as health care and nutrition, rural housing, cooperatives, folklore, civics, livestock breeding and savings. The TPT programs are either cast in a dramatic or in a more didactic mold. But the TPT films are always shot on location in the villages. The commentary of the telecasts is in French, the official language of the Ivory Coast.

The TPT broadcasts can be received by approximately 200,000 private TV owners[2], as well as by the approximately 1,800 TV schools, of which about 1,300 are located in small villages. In the TV schools there is supposed to be an animator, one of the local primary school teachers, who animates a viewing group of people who watch the TPT programs together.

After the TV program a group discussion is supposed to take place about which lessons can be derived from them. The films are made in collaboration with other ministries and agencies concerned with (rural) development issues.

For the survey, the results of which are presented and discussed in this report, ambitious initial goals were formulated. It should be added immediately that the final results fell short of the original intentions and expectations.

Three principal objectives were to be pursued:

1. To assess the impact of the TPT programs on the TPT audience, in terms of awareness (sensibilisation), learning and behavioral change or action.
2. To obtain reliable information about the composition of the TPT audience, about the viewing pattern of those who watch TV or TPT, and about the reasons why people watch or do not watch TV or TPT
3. To assess the attitude of the TPT audience concerning TPT itself, the actual programming, and to explore their opinion about the benefits and the beneficiaries of the out-of-school TV programs.

In previous studies[3] the basic TPT objectives were identified:

1. sensitization or awareness creation,
2. knowledge transmission
3. behavioral change or action.

Because the majority of TPT programs have a so-called sensitization objective the attitude change concerning the theme of a TPT program would be an important effect among the audience. An illustration of this is the increased awareness among the rural TPT spectators of the problems with respect to a

safe water supply. Some TPT programs aim also at transmitting some fundamental knowledge (for instance, the relationship between microbes in the water and waterborn diseases) or more practical how-to-do information (for example, with what kind of materials and in what way to construct a latrine). The third impact category is the effect of changing behavior or inciting to action. Behavior change is illustrated by drinking only purified water, while this precaution was not taken before having viewed the TV program. Action relates, for example, to a communal village action to collect money and to start the procedure of constructing a modern well in the village instead of relying on the traditional waterhole.

Although there was more or less reliable information about the socio-economic characteristics of the TPT spectators[4] it was thought that a large-scale survey, under more controlled conditions than usual, could add important new data in order to confirm (or not) certain patterns observed in the past.

Before explaining the research design and methodology with which the research objectives were to be pursued, we want to discuss some of the previous research findings which could elucidate the important questions.

1.2. Results of previous research

1.2.1. Introduction

Since the present study occurred at the end of a three-year research period, it seems necessary to present first a list of the results of previous studies which served as a starting point for our reflections. The results presented here are excerpted from five major reports dealing with TPT since its creation. In the following paragraphs these reports will be referred to by their authors.

1.2.2. Five research reports

The first report, by Kaye and Lenglet (1975), titled A Report on Out-of-School Television in the Ivory Coast before and during its First Operational Year, 1974-1975, dealt in particular with the original objectives, the organization, and the programming of TPT. It also considered - on the basis of quantitative research, literature study and personal observation - the recruitment, the motives and preferences of the TPT spectators, and TPT's impact.

The second report by Fritz (1976) was based on the analysis of data gathered by the TPT feedback system. This system operates through weekly reports completed and returned by a sample of TPT animators who report on attendance figures, reception conditions and other aspects of the TPT sessions. The report titled Le Public Atteint par Télé pour Tous (The Public Reached by TPT) presents in a quantitative fashion results concerning audience size, audience composition, viewing pattern, and aspects of the animation situation and the animator that influence TPT attendance for the year 1975-76.

The third report, The Impact of 25 Television Programs on Water, Produced and Broadcast by the Ivorian Out-of-School Education Project, written by Lenglet (1976), deals with the effects of two TV series on the dangers of polluted water. Quantitative data collected in 40 villages are presented, and the study discusses the objectives of the TV programs and their development, the composition and the regularity of the audience, and the impact in terms of awareness, knowledge and action.

The fourth report was published simultaneously with and accompanies the third report. Written by Grant and Seya (1976) and titled Visits to Twenty-Three Villages to Determine the Impact of the Water Series Produced

by the Out-of-School TV Department, November - December 1975, the report discusses the results of semi-directive interviews with groups of villagers and animators. Sections deal with the attitudes, perception and interests of the peasants vis à vis TPT, their viewing habits, and the impact of the TV programs.

The fifth study was undertaken by Benveniste (1976) in four villages. Based on participant observation and semi-directive interviews with more than 100 villagers, it is titled The Reception and Animation of Out-of-School Educational Television Programs in the Ivory Coast: a Case Study of Four Villages[5]. It presents detailed information about all the aspects and conditions of TPT animation: prior information and notification, participation, reception, discussion, animation and decisions and action.

1.2.3. Results

When reading the principal results listed below, the reader should bear in mind that each statement, once detached from its context, could be viewed as a general truth. It is impossible to remind the reader each time that the statement must be interpreted within its specific and partial context. It must also be borne in mind that none of the studies mentioned attempted to collect data which were to be representative for all the TPT villages, TPT spectators and TPT animators in the entire country. All studies concentrated on the essential aspect of the effectiveness and impact of the TPT operation. Given this research objective and the research conditions most data are of a qualitative nature, and must be interpreted as such. The results of the five reports are organized in the following categories:

1. audience composition
2. before and after TPT sessions

3. impact and obstacles to action

4. animators.

In parentheses the report and pages are indicated where these results can be found[6].

1.2.3.1. Audience composition:

1.2.3.1.1. Sex

- Women are under-represented among TPT viewers (Fritz, 1976 : 44 and Lenglet, 1976 : vi).
- There are three times more men than women, and two times more boys than girls (Kaye and Lenglet, 1975 : 7).
- Seventy percent of the spectators are male. Thirty percent are female (Lenglet, 1976 : 41).

1.2.3.1.2 Age

- The TPT audience consists of young men (between 15 and 45 years) who are "freer" and more attracted by "modern" things than the others (Benveniste, 1976 : iv).
- There are more young than old people among the TPT spectators (Lenglet, 1976 : vi).
- In comparison with the age distribution of the total population, the age group of 21-30 years is overrepresented among spectators (Lenglet, 1976 : 41).

1.2.3.1.3. Social status

- The village chiefs are rarely present at the TPT sessions (Fritz, 1976 : 23).
- The participants are not representative for the groups who have the socio-economic and political power in the village (Benveniste, 1976 : vi).

1.2.3.1.4. Education

- The more the people are educated the more they watch TPT (Fritz, 1976 : 13). In other words:
- "The spectators reached by TPT in the TV schools are mainly recruited among the people who at least partially have left the traditional rural sector" (Fritz, 1976 : 46).
- "It is very likely that literate people are overrepresentative among the audience. This would indicate that the primary target group of the programs: the rural, illiterate mass is not reached" (Lenglet, 1976 : vi).
- "Surveys of the Ivorian Institute for Public Opinion (IIOP) conducted in 1975 indicate that ... There is an over-representation of schooled individuals among the spectators of TPT" (Lenglet, 1976 : 39).

1.2.3.2. Before, during and after TPT sessions

1.2.3.2.1. Information about TPT

- The population is not sufficiently informed about TPT (Fritz, 1976 : 20).
- But for the first 29 TPT programs in 1975-76 almost all animators report that they have notified the villagers (Fritz, 1976 : 21).
- The effort by the Out-of-School animators to notify the village population about the objectives of the program is insufficient. Since then no regular information mechanism - except the use of the school pupils - has been implemented, which is seen by the absence of regular invitations for the TPT sessions (Benveniste, 1976 : iii, iv and 43).

1.2.3.2.2. The school

- We assume that the number of spectators is smaller in the schools of those villages where private individuals own a TV set (Fritz, 1976 : 20).
- And this sentiment is repeated in Grant and Seya, 1976 : 39.
- The school is marked by its "foreigness" to the village psychologically and its position at the edge of villages, physically, and the decision by the government to organize adult education there is not unanimously accepted (Benveniste, 1976 : iv).
- The school is not made for attracting adults (Fritz, 1976 : 20).

1.2.3.2.3. Motivation of the TPT audience

- There are no specific reasons why people watch TPT. "In contrast with this, the reasons for not coming to the programs, or not anymore, are more detailed" : work in the field, loss of interest over time, TV programs not adapted to the region, funerals, celebrations, distance, bad weather . . . (Kaye and Lenglet, 1975 : 41, 42).
- There are two major factors explaining why TPT has remained so unpopular: the lack of information to the prospective audience, and the listening place (TV school) (Fritz, 1976 : 20).

1.2.3.2.4. Regularity of viewing

- Whether the number of regular spectators is large or small does not affect the number of occasional spectators. There

are few occasional spectators, which means that the viewing group does not attract new members over time (Fritz, 1976 : 43).

- The regularity with which the rural spectators watch TPT is smaller than the regularity of urban spectators (Lenglet, 1976 : 39).
- "If 'regularly' is defined as 'having watched at least half of all TPT programs', it would mean that more than 50% of the interviewed spectators are regular ones" (Lenglet, 1976 : 43). But caution in interpreting these data is important because there are reasons to believe that the animators who report these data present a positively biased picture.
- During our observations we have not noticed any systematic selection of adult spectators. This means that they do not form a homogeneous audience (Benveniste, 1976 : 95).

1.2.3.2.5. Animation

- Over time there is a decrease in the number of TV schools opened for TPT (Lenglet, 1976 : v and Fritz, 1976 : 14).
- One third of the spectators leave the classroom at the end of the TPT program (Kaye and Lenglet, 1975 : 16).
- If the essential role of the animation is not recognized by the villagers it is because it is not very visible ... and ... the animation of the viewing sessions does not have a determining influence on the attendance (Benveniste, 1976 : v).

- A minority of interviewees stated that they were no longer regular spectators because of their disillusion after so many discussions, following the adult TV program, that had degenerated into meaningless exchanges (Grant and Seya, 1976 : 21).
- The animators have problems in controlling the situation, either because the audience is uninterested or noisy, or because they transform the session into a political forum where a small group makes itself into the spokesperson for the demands and requests of the villagers (Benveniste, 1976 : v).

1.2.3.2.6. Distinction between TPT and TV in general

- The peasants emphasized the educational role of TV and the larger correspondence between the TV programs and rural life. But a certain confusion about the difference between TPT and TV programs in general was also observed (Grant and Seya, 1976 : 16).
- Some indications show that there is no clear distinction between the general TV programs and TPT. The content of the telecasts before and after TPT and the confusions between the TPT and general programs lead to a certain "disturbance" of the animation sessions (Benveniste, 1976 : vi and 96).

1.2.3.2.7. Perception of TPT and TV

- According to the observers the spectators came because the TV programs provide instruction and information (Kaye and Lenglet, 1976 : 41).
- TV gives educational advice and informs people about national

events. The great majority have a favorable opinion about TPT. They fully understand the general objective of the program: improving rural living conditions through a series of educational messages (Grant and Seya, 1976 : 16).

- The participation is more explained by TV's prestige and by the attraction of its entertainment programs rather than its educational programs (Benveniste, 1976 : v). One explanation is the following: the TPT sessions are classified in the category of profane and leisure activities (Benveniste, 1976 : 96).

1.2.3.2.8. TPT audience preferences and their correspondence with TPT programs

- "We could draw the conclusion that the overall majority of the animators and the listening groups prefer to watch programs dealing with health, agriculture and literacy" (Kaye and Lenglet, 1975 : 22).
- The following list of themes preferred by the villagers is only suggestive: nutrition, health and hygiene (Grant and Seya, 1976 : 67).
- There is a perfect correspondence between the first priority choices (agriculture and health) and the 1974-75 TPT programs. More than half of the programs (56%) were devoted to health and agricultural subjects (Kaye and Lenglet, 1975 : 34).
- The peasants stressed the educational role of TV and the great correspondence between its programming and the realities of rural life (Grant and Seya, 1976 : 16).

- The villagers accept more readily the model proposed by TPT when this corresponds to the model of urban consumption (Benveniste, 1976 : vi).

1.2.3.3. TPT impact and obstacles to action

1.2.3.3.1. TPT impact

- We heard many intentions expressed to follow up the various lessons given during the programs but not any example was found with respect to concrete actions or changes in behavior (Kaye and Lenglet, 1975 : 14).
- There is a big difference between the number of spectators reached by the broadcasts and the number of persons who apply and practice the lesson received (Lenglet, 1976).
- Nevertheless we have personally observed some implementations which witness the good will of the villagers. The problem is to know whether these are due to TPT impact (Grant and Seya, 1976 : 33-34).
- The TPT water programs created awareness of problems related to water and of solutions for having a safe water supply. It is certain that people acquired new knowledge about health practices, and started implementing them. A number of villages after having watched one or several water programs started the process of well construction. Few villages had a well at the end of the program series (1 year) (Lenglet, 1976 : vi).
- The animation sessions do not lead to communal decision-making (Benveniste, 1976 : vi).
- The memorization of the educational content is weak, the more so for specific educational lessons (Benveniste, 1976 : vi).

1.2.3.3.1. Obstacles to action

- The principal obstacles to applying TPT advice are: lack of interest on the part of village leaders, isolated, busy or poor villagers; traditional beliefs which do not allow acceptance of "scientific" knowledge; poor communication with general administration; lack of supply of requested material, in this case water filters (Grant and Seya, 1976 : 63).
- The major obstacles to a real impact of the water series is in the lack of local organization, the lack of (access to) material and organizational resources, the lack of cooperation of administrative authorities, the lack of communication support, and the strength of traditional customs and beliefs (Lenglet, 1976 : vi).
- The discussions remain blocked on the level of problems which are socio-political and the solution of which does not lie within the villager's domain: the participating groups are not representative for the groups who have the power (Benveniste, 1976 : vi).
- The acceptance of the model proposed by the TV is limited everywhere by the socio-economic constraints of its adoption (Benveniste, 1976 : vi).

1.2.3.4. The Animator

- The animator is seen as a government agent (Benveniste, 1976 : iv).
- It is observed that in 68 percent of the schools in the feedback sample at least one teacher-animator speaks the local language

(Fritz, 1976 : 26).

- Many spectators regret the fact that "TPT" broadcasts in French and not in local languages. They argue that French as the communication medium does not facilitate comprehension of the TV message (Grant and Seya, 1976 : 22).
- The more the animator speaks the dominant language of the village where he is stationed, the more the people come to TPT (Fritz, 1976 : 26).
- The more frequent personal contact the animator has with the village chief, the more the chief attends the TPT sessions in the school (Fritz, 1976 : 23).
- Animators have problems in getting field agents to participate in the animation of TPT programs, when these programs require their help in mobilizing people into a communal action (Benveniste, 1976 : iii, viii, 64).
- Animators' motivation and interest for TPT decreases by lack of payment for their supplementa work (Grant and Seya, 1976 : 23-24; and elsewhere).

1.2.4. Synthetic summary

Going over this list of results and conclusions it is interesting to note on the one hand that most statements, although made by different authors, correspond with each other despite some slight variations. On the other hand, there are statements, of which there are only a few, which though not immediately contradictory, express opposing tendencies and interpretations.

In the foregoing list the results were presented according to the different chapters of the studies from which they originated. Now we will

group them more synthetically according to the criterion of their convergence or divergence.

A. <u>The statements converge on the following points:</u>

1. The TPT audience consists essentially of more or less educated young men without significant social status in the village. Consequently, the total of the rural population, which is the target group, is not reached.
2. The means to inform and to notify the population about TPT programs are not the most effective.
3. The school is not the best place for watching TPT.
4. The reasons why people come and watch TPT are not very specific. In contrast the reasons for not coming are numerous and varied.
5. The animation sessions are not what they are supposed to be.
6. One-third of the spectators leave the classroom after the TPT broadcast.
7. The TPT impact in terms of awareness creation, learning and action is small.
8. TPT is not so popular, and over time a decline of audience interest is observed.
9. There are numerous declarations of intention which remain without effect or without communal decision-making. It must be noted, however, that the impact of the water programs seems to be better.
10. The obstacles to a real impact are numerous and varied. For example, without the consent of village authorities, who are to be found among the older people, no decision for a collective action can be taken.

11. The positive motivation of animators is declining.

B. The statements diverge on the following points:

1. The existence of a TPT viewing or listening group composed of regular spectators is not certain. But it could be that regularity partly depends on whether there is a campaign type of programming (e.g., water series) or whether disconnected programs dealing with a series of different topics are telecast.
2. Many reports assume that the animation of TPT sessions is always taking place. However, a certain doubt remains about its weekly systematic occurrence.
3. It cannot be assumed that people make a clear distinction between TV in general and TPT, although some reports seem to do this. It is necessary to measure the degree of confusion between the TPT and general TV programming.
4. The correspondence between the TPT broadcast and the realities of rural life are not as perfect as some reports assume.
5. The reported number of people reached by TPT varies with the source of the information. Animators' estimates are always higher than estimates based on personal observation.
6. It is often assumed that villagers are systematically notified in advance about TPT. Certain studies report that no information at all about TPT is given.

As we will see in the following chapter these statements and their points of convergence and divergence form the working hypotheses for the construction of the research design and the measuring instruments.

REFERENCES

1. These reports are included in the Bibliographic References.
2. Ivory Coast Republic, 1976 b.
3. Kaye and Lenglet, 1975; Bourgault, 1975, Jouët, 1976.
4. Fritz, 1976 and Lenglet, 1976.
5. This is an English summary of an originally French document: L'Action d'Animation Entreprise pour Encadrer la Reception du Programme d'Education Télévisuelle Extra-Scolaire en Côte d'Ivoire, written in 1976.
6. When referring to Benveniste's 1976 report, the pages of the original French text are indicated, and not the pages in the English summary (Benveniste, 1977).

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY AND FIELD RESEARCH

2.1. Introduction

Given the three main research objectives: assessing TPT's impact, identifying TPT's audience size, audience composition and viewing patterns, and determining the perceptions toward TPT and its (potential) beneficiaries, several research designs and data gathering techniques could have been chosen for the current study to be reported. There were, however, a number of considerations and constraints which limited the alternatives, and which determined to a large extent our final choices. Field research, like this study, is not performed under laboratory conditions. The limits in time, personnel, financial and other material resources do not only affect the immediate research effort, but evaluation-research itself is directed to the operation and the effects of a program that is operating under real-world conditions. Therefore, it should not be surprising that certain initial decisions regarding the research design and sampling procedures were modified under the requirements of the research setting and thus produced results which should not be measured with the yardstick of laboratory experiments. Moreover, it is important to realize that from the beginning of this study we had decided to base at least part of the data gathering on individual interviews. In the past evaluation data had been collected through animators' feedback reports (Fritz, 1976), through questionnaires completed by 40 village observers (Lenglet, 1976), through participant observation in four villages (Benveniste, 1976) and through group interviews (Grant and Seya, 1976).

The results reported here are the first large-scale attempt to have individual interviews with peasants concerning TPT, using trained

interviewers, and this was in complete disagreement with the almost unanimous opinion that it is impossible to conduct a quantitative survey among the rural population of the Ivory Coast.

With these considerations in mind, we will present in this chapter first the original research design and the reasons for including in the sample TV villages as well as non-TV villages. Second, the theoretical sampling procedure is explained. The development and formulation of the research instruments (questionnaires) forms the third section. And the fourth section deals with the actual process of the field survey.

2.2. The original research design

To a significant degree the objective that sought to assess the attitude, learning and action impact of the TPT programs on the spectators, determined the original research design. This objective called for a sort of experimental "Before-After" or "Pre-Post" design with a control group[1]. We were conscious of the fact that in a field setting strict experimental conditions are difficult to create. But if these could be approached it would be possible to control a number of intervening variables which could explain the relationship between watching TPT and TPT's impact. In schematic form the design looked as follows:[2]

		Time 1		Time 2
TV village	(TPT spectators	0	X	0
	(non-TPT spectators	0		0
non-TV village	non TPT spectators	0		0

The original idea was to administer a measure at Time 1, before the broadcasting of a certain number and kind of TPT programs (X) in order to

determine the characteristics, attitudes, knowledge and behavior/action of three groups of respondents. The measurements at Time 1 would be used as a baseline with which to compare measures of the same variables at Time 2. By using one "experimental" group (TPT spectators in TV villages) and one "control" group (non-TPT spectators in TV villages and in non-TV villages), it would theoretically be possible to determine whether possible changes between Time 1 and Time 2 were significantly related to having been exposed to the TPT programs.

Still based on the original research objective of measuring impact, it was decided that the "control" or "comparison" group should consist of non-TPT spectators in villages with a TV school as well as in villages without a TV school. We thought that in TV villages a certain spillover or indirect effect of TV watching might operate: Non-spectators in TV villages may benefit indirectly from those who watch and discuss TPT programs in a two-step type of influence. Therefore, and because villages with a TV school may be highly different from villages without TV schools in terms of socio-economic levels, it was also decided to include non-spectators in non-TV villages in the "comparison" group.

Although in this design the unit of analysis is formed by the group of TPT spectators versus the group of non-spectators, the unit of data collection is primarily the individual, which is reflected in the sampling and data gathering procedures.

Due to a number of research requirements and other circumstances - some of which will be discussed in the following section - the original design proved to be impossible, especially during the data analysis stage. Moreover, the design itself may have been questionable from the beginning given the brief period between the two observations at Time 1 and Time 2. The baseline survey

was conducted in January 1977 and the post-survey was carried out in April 1977. It is difficult to expect that in a three-month period, major effects of having watched a small number of TPT programs would be manifest.

2.2.1. Problems with the original design

There are two principal reasons why, especially after the baseline survey and later in the analysis stage, the original research design was largely abandoned, and consequently, the quasi-experimental study of TPT's impact on awareness, knowledge and behavior was modified. It should be added immediately that this did not mean that impact was not studied at all. In fact, in the following chapters data concerning the recall of TPT programs watched, decisions made and actions taken after having watched TPT and obstacles to these decisions and actions are analyzed.

First there was a reason of "force majeure." There were two brief series of TPT programs, one dealing with livestock raising and the other dealing with (human) vaccination which had been planned for the period between January and April 1977, the two time points of the pre- and the post-survey. But the second TV series on vaccination programmed for late March were never broadcast. As a consequence, the evaluation of the impact of a number of specific telecasts dealing with vaccination became impossible. During the pre-survey, the individual questionnaire contained questions on livestock raising as well as vaccination. Because the vaccination programs were not shown, these vaccination questions were not repeated in the post-survey. Therefore, a test of awareness-creation, knowledge gain or even habit modification as a result of having seen the vaccination programs was excluded.

Secondly, our impressions at the end of the first survey in January influenced formulation of the post-questionnaire, especially with respect to the "experimental treatment": the TV programs on animal husbandry. From

the pre-survey it was found that very few people were engaged in livestock raising, so a repetition of livestock questions on the total sample did not seem called for. An attempt to concentrate instead on the attitudes, knowledge and actions of the respondents who in January said that they were counseled by the SODEPRA, the livestock development agency, however, failed, as is explained in Chapter 6.

Although the original design was abandoned in later stages of the research, it influenced the decisions for the sampling design as is presented in the following sections.

2.3. Sampling design

2.3.1. Introduction

The research design, in its original form, required that efforts be made to obtain a sample of villages and individual respondents which would be more or less representative of the country's population. It also required that as many different variables as possible should be measured which could explain possible impact findings or differences in audience composition and varying attitudes concerning TPT. Therefore, it was decided to choose a certain number of villages in each of the three main regions of the country: forest in the South, wooded savanna in the Center and savanna in the North, and to sample a limited number of people in each village.

The three selected regions are in the first place climatic zones. There is, however, a large correspondence between the climate and the agricultural crops which are grown here. The kind of crops - for example, coffee, cocoa and other export crops in the South, and rice, cotton and food crops in the North - determine to a large extent the income level of the three regions. Therefore, the people in the forest in the South are on the average richer than those living in the wooded savanna in the Center,

and these are on the average richer than the inhabitants of the savanna in the North. Moreover, the three regions comprise the main ethnic groups and religions of the country. Thus, by selecting "region" as a first sampling base, the basic characteristics of villages, ethnic group, religion, wealth, type of agricultural crops, were insured representation in the final sample.

As a second step 22 villages were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

- All villages should be accessible by road, and possibilities of food and lodging for the interviewers should be available.
- For the field research only two vehicles were available, as well as a limited amount of financing, time and interview personnel.

Therefore:

- Nine villages should be in the district of each of the 9 ACRIS[3] whose service was solicited. By accident, not by design - having no control over the location of their posts - four ACRIS were assigned a forest village, four other ACRIS had a village in the wooded savanna, and one ACRI was going to do the survey in a savanna village.
- Together with the TV villages to be visited by the 9 ACRIS 7 other TV villages were to be selected. Of the 16 TV villages, 7 were selected in the forest region, 5 in the wooded savanna, and 4 in the savanna.
- There should be a certain number of non-TV villages in order to find out whether TV villages differ from non-TV villages
- These non-TV villages should be in the same region and comprise the same ethnic group as the 16 TV villages

in order to enhance the comparability between them. Preferably the non-TV villages should also have a school.

- Given that there are relatively few villages with a school without TV which would be close to a selected TV village and which would be accessible, only 6 non-TV villages were selected. Because the northern part of the country is less educationally endowed than other regions, it is not accidental that it was easier to find non-TV villages there than elsewhere. We finally selected 1 village in the forest, 2 in the wooded savanna and 3 in the savanna.

As a third step it was decided that a maximum of 600 individuals should be interviewed. Since both TPT spectators and non-spectators were to be selected from TV villages, it was decided that in such villages 30 persons were to be sampled and interviewed, while in the non-TV villages 20 persons were to be selected.

2.3.2. Random or non-random sample

The design originally adopted could only be used if the "experimental" and the "control" group would show a similar distribution of basic characteristics, such as sex, age, socio-economic status, to begin with. This would have meant that the individuals in both groups should be randomly selected or matched on these characteristics before the start of the "treatment", i.e., the broadcasting of the TV programs. In general, field conditions preclude a random selection from either "treatment" or "comparison" group. And this is certainly the case in the Ivory Coast where people do not have equal access to TPT to begin with. Moreover, although on the one hand the impact objective called for a quasi-experimental design with random selection or matched groups, on the other hand, we wanted to obtain a clearer picture of

those who come and watch TPT and those who do not. This research objective could be satisfied by randomly selecting a certain number of respondents. However, if we were to use a complete random sample then with respect to the impact objective, the "experimental" respondents were certainly to be self-selected and thus not matched with the "comparison" respondents. Also, a random sample for meeting the audience profile objective was excluded from the start, not only because of the costs and logistics, but because the actual TPT audience represents a very limited proportion (1.5 to 5 percent) of the adult TPT target audience with access to a TV school[4], and thus only a very limited number of spectators would be included in the sample.

The possibility of having a random sample was also excluded for other, more practical, reasons. Random sampling requires an up-to-date and complete list of village inhabitants, as well as an easy system to identify selected individuals. Neither condition was true of Ivorian villages.

A national population census had been held in April 1975, but only global data were available. Moreover, occasional administrative censuses are held in the different sub-prefecturs, but they are not up-to-date. Besides, given the nature of the Ivorian names and the unreliability of much official information it would have been impossible to identify a sample of 20 to 30 people among a total village population of 500 to 1500: many persons have the same name, and there are no street names or house numbers. In short, it was impossible to develop an adequate sampling frame for a probabilistic sample[5].

Despite these constraints and in order to verify the impossibility of a probabilistic sample under actual circumstances an attempt was made during the pretesting of the survey instruments to randomly select the respondents. In one TV village the chiefs of all the neighborhoods were gathered.

They in turn convened the chiefs of all the households in their neighborhood. The number of members in each household was established and each household head received as many sequentially numbered tickets as there were household members. Researchers kept track of the numbers distributed in each household and each neighborhood. After all households had been "covered" the total number of tickets distributed was counted and using a random number table, 30 numbers were drawn. In theory these 30 numbers could be traced back to certain neighborhoods, households and individuals. But the poor results of the experiment suggested a series of problems with this method:

- either the numbered tickets had not been distributed (properly);
- or the tickets had been distributed but had been lost;
- or the head of the household was opposed to the selection of an "unimportant" (young, woman) household member and the exclusion of himself;
- or the sampled individual had become tired of waiting for the interviewer and had left for the fields.

Although a random sample was called for, it was impossible to be carried out. Thus, a non-random sampling technique was adopted: the stratified quota sample.

2.3.3. Stratified quota sampling

For the first research purpose, TPT impact assessment, it was important that sufficient numbers of various socio-economic categories would be represented in the sample on the one hand, and that comparable respondents - complete "matching" being excluded - would be included in the group of TPT spectators and non-spectators. Therefore it was decided to stratify according to sex and age in both TV and non-TV villages. However, because of the

peculiarities of TPT which attracts usually more men than women and more younger than older people the different age and sex categories in the sample would not be proportional to their distribution in the village population, which as we have indicated, was unknown.

In a quota sample each interviewer is assigned a certain number of respondents with certain characteristics. The interviewer is responsible for locating and interviewing the individuals who respond to these characteristics.

Here it should be noted that many biases can result from judgmental or purposive samples such as the quota sample. These limit the generalizibility of the results, which means that findings pertain only to the sample itself and cannot be considered to be representative for the population from which the sample is drawn. And also

> "Strictly speaking, probability statistics are not applicable to non-probability samples. And, any sample for which the probability of unit-selection is unknown at any stage of the sampling is not a probability sample."[6]

With a stratified quota sample we wished, within the constraints of the field research conditions, to maintain a comparability between TPT spectators and non-spectators (in the TV villages), and to facilitate the actual selection of respondents.

For the TV and non-TV villages the quotas as presented in Table 2-1 were set.

The quota for men was larger than for women because it was thought that, socially and culturally speaking, it would be more difficult to select and interview women than men. This consideration was based on past research. Moreover, it was felt that it was more important to have the responses of men

TABLE 2-1

SAMPLE QUOTAS IN TV AND NON-TV VILLAGES

	TV Village		Non-TV Village	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
16-25 years	6	4	5	2
26-45 years	10	4	7	3
46 and older	4	2	2	1
Total	20	10	14	6

than of women because the former are the holders of the social and economic power in the traditional village structure. The importance of the social position of the men was also confirmed by the previous finding that at least 70 percent of the TPT audience consists of men, and that during the discussion after the TPT broadcast, men speak up much more frequently than women.

With respect to the age of the respondents, we knew that older people (over 45 years) are less frequent TV watchers than other age groups. Also, it is a fact that due to (temporary) migration and schooling, many members of the age group of 15 to 25 years are not present in the village. Moreover, these young people do not have the socio-economic power to make decisions and take actions concerning TPT. For these reasons the oldest and youngest age groups were assigned smaller quotas than the middle group of 26 to 45 year olds.[7]

It was also decided that the interviewers should take care not to include a disproportionate number of higher-placed persons or village authorities among the people to be interviewed. Past research had indicated

that these kinds of people do not often attend. But because they effectively control the decision-making process in the village, a certain number of village chiefs and elders were to be interviewed, but - as far as possible - in correspondence to their actual numbers in the villages.

In the last place, in the TV villages, the sampling should attempt to include at least 15 TPT spectators spread evenly over the different quotas. To achieve this objective the animators in the selected TV villages were asked to "census" all their spectators during a three-week period in November 1976. We thought that this list of all "regular" spectators could be matched with the quota requirements, and thus at least 15 spectators could be interviewed. As it turned out (Section 2.5.3), this procedure backfired, and after a few attempts the lists with TPT spectators were discarded and spectators were identified in a different fashion.

For the characteristics of the persons actually sampled, and for the "fit" between the theoretical quotas and the actual sample, the reader is referred to Section 3.3.

In this section we have discussed the sampling design and criteria. We will now direct our attention to the creation of the research instruments.

2.4. The instruments

From the beginning it had been our intention to conduct a survey among individuals. We intended to relate individually gathered data to characteristics of the village in which these individuals lived as well as to characteristics of TPT sessions and TPT animation, where appropriate. The research objectives and the research design called for a pre- and post-survey concerning:

1. Awareness, knowledge and action related to the "experimental

treatment": two TPT series on vaccination and animal husbandry;

2. Socio-economic characteristics and habits of TPT spectators and non-spectators;
3. Attitudes and opinions about TPT and its effects and beneficiaries.

In this section we will present the various instruments used in the pre- and the post-survey. The baseline measures were taken in January 1977, the "treatment" occurred in late January and February 1977, while the post-survey was conducted in April 1977. In the following sub-sections we will first distinguish between the January and April surveys, and, secondly, between the four instruments or questionnaires used during each survey.

2.4.2. The January survey

In the pre-survey four questionnaires were used.

- There was a general questionnaire to the total survey population of 600 people which contained a common first part followed by two distinct parts, one for villages with a TV school, and one for villages without a TV school[8].
- A second questionnaire was created for the school directors in the TV villages.
- A third questionnaire was to be used for interviewing all the village chiefs and village elders.
- Fourthly, there was a questionnaire for the SODEPRA (animal husbandry agency) and the health agents concerning two program series to be studied. These agents

were to be interviewed in TV as well as non-TV villages.

All four questionnaires with their variations will be successively presented in the following paragraphs.

2.4.2.1. Individual questionnaire in TV villages

This questionnaire had a screening question (Q. 41)[9] which determined whether the respondent watched TV. If s/he did not, the questionnaire was terminated at this point, while the TV spectator was asked another 40 questions. Thus, for the TV spectator, there were 81 questions which took about one hour to complete. These included open-ended questions but the majority were closed-ended. The questions can be regrouped around the following points:

- Identification of the respondents (Q. 1-19): Besides the usual questions about the name, sex, age and level of schooling, there were also questions about the ethnic group of the respondent; his/her religion, membership in a voluntary association and income. The importance of these variables had been mentioned in previous reports but had not been thoroughly measured. In this part, pains were taken to establish unambiguously the name of the respondents, the name of his/her neighborhood and the name of the neighborhood chief, in order to facilitate relocating him/her during the post-survey.
- Baseline measure: The attitudes, knowledge and habits of the respondents with regard to the themes of two TPT series scheduled for the January - April 1977 period: vaccination and livestock raising (Q. 20-29 and 30-40).

- TV and TPT watching: Habits, days, place and regularity of watching TV and TPT; audience preferences concerning TV and TPT; aspects of TPT animation sessions and recall of the subjects of TPT programs (Q. 41-60 and 74-76).
- Perceived TPT beneficiaries: Questions were asked on who the respondent thought were the people who profited from TPT watching. What were the benefits of watching, and to what extent did the TPT programs correspond with rural reality (Q. 61-70 and 77,78).
- TPT impact: Impact of past TPT programs was measured in terms of retention and recall of advice, and adoption and application of advice, and obstacles to action (Q. 79-83).

2.4.2.2. TV school director questionnaire

This questionnaire centered on the opinions and judgments of the 16 directors (and possibly TPT animators) of schools with TV reception. Questions were asked concerning TPT, its reception, viewing patterns over time, audience preferences, differences between different audience sections, orientation to action. Also, some factual questions were asked about the TPT animators and the opening of the school on TPT nights and other days of the week, and the estimates of the TPT audience. A last, unstructured, part of the questionnaire was meant to obtain the school director's opinion about TV education (in school and out-of-school) in general. It was thought that these opinions could provide some basis for explaining the success of TPT (lack thereof) in a particular TV village.

2.4.2.3. Individual questionnaire in non-TV villages

This questionnaire had 47 questions. It took 15 to 30 minutes to

complete depending on whether the respondent had had the occasion to have watched TV or not. On the one hand, the questionnaire repeats the same questions as for the TV village respondents with regard to the characteristics of the respondent, and attitudes, knowledge and behavior concerning vaccination and animal husbandry (Q. 1-40).

On the other hand, there were 8 questions (Q. A1 - A8) dealing with TV watching. Although almost by definition non-TV villages do not have TV receivers it was thought interesting to explore the extent to which TV affects rather isolated villages and villagers[10]. Therefore, questions were asked about whether they knew about TV, and for those who watched TV, what kind of programs they watched and what their viewing habits were.

2.4.2.4. Village chief questionnaire

The questionnaire for all the 22 village chiefs and the village elders was conceived to provide a detailed context for the study of each village community. There are factual questions about the material infrastructure of the village, its most urgent development problems and the chief's opinion about the rural exodus.

2.4.2.5. Field agent questionnaire

From the modern livestock agent of the SODEPRA as well as from the agent of any of the health services in the countryside, we wanted to obtain two kinds of information. On the one hand, we needed information about their past and present extension activities, as a context for TPT impact. On the other hand, we wanted to know whether these agents knew about TPT, and what their relationship with the local TPT animator was.

2.4.3. The April survey

The post-survey utilized also four instruments:

- A general questionnaire for all the individual respondents

in TV and non-TV villages, and with a special section for TV watching of TV villagers[11].

- A questionnaire for TV school directors, which differed from the January questionnaire for the same persons.
- A very special questionnnaire for those in TV and non-TV villages who in January had reported that they received extension help from the SODEPRA.
- A checklist for determining whether certain actions which, in January, some respondents claimed to have done after having watched TPT, had really been undertaken.

Before presenting all four instruments, it is necessary to explain the reasons why the correspondence between the pre- and post-questionnaires was not as large as we originally had intended.

In the first place - and this was already discussed in Section 2.2.1 - one of the TV series dealing with vaccination, which was supposed to be part of the "experimental treatment" was never broadcast. Therefore, it did not make sense to repeat any question in the individual questionnaire dealing with vaccination.

In the second place, during the January survey many of the respondents seemed to be confused when asked questions on animal husbandry. This was due to either the formulation of these questions, or what seems also very plausible, to complete ignorance of the respondents with regard to systematic (modern as well as traditional) livestock raising. Therefore, the pre-survey questions on animal husbandry were not repeated in April, and questions dealing with this matter were only asked to self-reported livestock raisers.

In the third place, after the January pre-survey, it seemed necessary to reformulate certain questions about TPT. This reformulation purported to create in the minds of the TV spectators a unit of ambiguity between TV in general and TPT in particular. During the pre-questionnaire we had the clear impression that there existed a confusion with respect to TV and TPT among the respondents. And it did not seem to be our task to clarify this confusion but, on the contrary, to record it in its complexity. Therefore, the April questionnaire did not try anymore to determine with direct questions whether a respondent was a TPT spectator. Instead, on the basis of responses to various overlapping and "screening" questions dealing, e.g., with the days of TV watching, and the kind of TV programs watched, we attempted to define the TPT spectator in contrast with the general TV spectator. Actually, the objective was still to identify the real TPT viewers, but this time from another, less immediate perspective.

As a consequence, the April questionnaire does not have the same questions for measuring the impact of the animal husbandry series and for determining the audience profile. As explained before (see Section 2.2.1), this is also the immediate effect of abandoning the original research design. What it means is that the nature of the data changed. And this puts certain limitations on the final interpretation: it is impossible to assess TPT impact in quantitative terms or with statistical techniques for the majority of the respondents. And also, the non-correspondence of the TV and TPT questions in January and April added another dimension to the final analysis, thus making it possible to compare the TPT audience profile and viewing patterns established over a long period of several years on the one hand, and the actual profile and pattern during a recent short period of 2 1/2 months on the other hand.

With this in mind, let us present the four April instruments.

2.4.3.1. Individual questionnaire in TV villages

This questionnaire of 67 questions took about one hour to complete. As in the pre-questionnaire, almost all questions were pre-coded and close-ended, but there were some open-ended questions. The following parts can be distinguished:

- Identification of the respondents (Q. 1-19): Though more or less similar to the pre-survey, this part had two peculiarities: On the one hand, it tried to find out why respondents who had been present in January could not be relocated. On the other hand, we attempted to improve the personal annual income measure based on determining the annual income per family and per family member.
- Behavior towards modern livestock raising: If the respondent said that s/he used the service of the SODEPRA, a special questionnaire (see Section 2.4.3.3.) was administered.
- Decisions: Questions 25 and 26 were meant to determine the respondent's attitude about the problems concerning who has the power to make decisions regarding the start of certain individual or communal development projects.
- TV watching since January: Questions dealt with habits, day, place and regularity of watching; TV program preferences among the audience; recall of TPT programs and aspects of TPT animation sessions (Q. 27-36). There

were also questions about the correspondence between TPT programs and the daily reality of rural life (Q. 42-45).

- TPT impact: This was assessed in terms of decision-making after TPT programs (Q. 37-40) and in terms of recalling the specific messages and lessons of the TPT series on animal husbandry and the SIKATIO series (Q. 52-67)[12]. Questions dealing with this latter aspect were only asked to those who reported having viewed the animal husbandry or SIKATIO programs.
- If the respondent in answer to Question 27 appeared to be a non-spectator since January, the interview was ended after having asked the reasons for not watching (Q. 28).

2.4.3.2. Individual questionnaire in non-TV villages

This questionnaire was completely identical with the first part (Q. 1-26) of the individual questionnaire in TV villages (Section 2.4.2.1), including the part of identification of respondents, behavior towards modern livestock raising and decisions. No questions were formulated about TV watching or TPT impact in non-TV villages because we felt that the January instrument had provided sufficient data, and because the original research design had been abandoned.

2.4.3.3. TV school director questionnaire

This questionnaire was a follow-up of the January questionnaire. It was shorter and it concentrated on the operation of TPT since January. Questions were asked about the TPT audience and the animation sessions, and about the personal TV program preferences and impressions of the director and, sometimes, of the TPT animator.

2.4.3.4. SODEPRA questionnaire

On the basis of the answers to Question 32 of the pre-questionnaire (see also Section 2.4.2.1.), it had been determined whether a respondent made use of the extension service of the SODEPRA in order to "modernize" his livestock raising methods. In April, everybody who had been identified as SODEPRA livestock raisers was administered this special questionnaire, which became another data source for TPT-impact evaluation, together with the checklist to be discussed in Section 2.4.3.5. The SODEPRA questionnnaire comprised questions about the behavior and attitudes of the modern livestock raisers with respect to animal husbandry, and also a group of questions measuring the recall of certain specific TPT messages dealing with modern animal husbandry.

2.4.3.5. Action checklist

During the pre-survey, two questions (Q. 72-73) were asked to the TPT spectators in TV villages about the decisions made and actions taken as a consequence of having watched TPT. A list of actions and decisons was made for each item with the name of the respondent who claimed s/he had done it. During the post-survey, all the decisions and/or actions were verified by the interviewers. They requestioned the respondent about his/her claims and asked to see the results of the action, e.g., water filter, latrine. We felt that checking their claims was important because in the past there had been indications that impact of TPT programs remained limited to "pious wishes" which did not materialize.

We will now direct our attention to the preparation and execution of the actual surveys which were to take place in January and April 1977.

2.5. The surveys

2.5.1. Introduction: about impact measurement

As explained in previous sections, the decision to conduct two surveys was the immediate result of the research design which, in its turn, was determined by one of the original research objectives: to measure the impact of a number of TPT programs.

Impact of educational or information programs is commonly divided into three categories: awareness creation or attitude change; knowledge and skills transmission or learning; and behavior change or implemented action. Usually these three categories are placed in a hierarchical order with the understanding that awareness of a certain issue precedes knowledge about it, and that learning precedes a change in habits. For example, the TPT series on water (see Lenglet, 1976) had as its objective to sensitize the population about the dangers of polluted water, to transmit fundamental knowledge about the causes of polluted water (microbes) and its effects (diseases), to indicate ways to improve the village water situation by filtering water or constructing a well and to incite the audience to change individual behavior by boiling or filtering water or to start communal action by constructing a well or improving the waterhole.

It is clear that the hierarchical ordering of the three impact categories is not completely correct. There is interaction among the categories which makes that action precede further learning and that only through acquiring certain knowledge an attitude change or awareness is brought about. What is important here, however, is that there are distinguishable impact aspects and that the time needed for their appearance differs: Usually it will take much more time to see behavior change or to start and complete an

action after having been exposed to an educational message, than to observe that some learning has taken place or that attitudes have changed. Therefore, when trying to measure the impact of an educational program, the length of the time period between the message and the impact will determine to a large extent what impact aspect will be observable. When we did our study of the impact of the water series, for example, about one-half to one year after their telecasting, it was relatively easy to assess whether more people than before the series were aware of the dangers of polluted water and knew about the mechanism of disease contamination. But it was much more difficult to find situations in which individuals or villages had done something to improve their water supply. We found that the process of well construction may take years, from the first village decision through the process of money collecting and request to the Sub-Prefect to the actual drilling. But we also observed that the purchase of a water filter took less time, although it posed financial difficulties for the peasants.

When in 1975 it had been decided to conduct in 1976-77 research on the impact of the TPT programs we hoped that the Out-of-School Educational Television Department (OSTV), which produces the TPT programs, would program a long series in the beginning of the season, and that we could measure the impact of this series. On the one hand, a long series probably would include all three impact elements: awareness, knowledge and action, and its "early" broadcasting would allow sufficient time to produce effects with respect to these three elements. As we will see in the following two sections, this was not the case, and because of other logistic constraints - two short TV series on animal husbandry and vaccination were chosen as "experimental treatment" - the effects of which were to be measured.

2.5.2. The "treatment" and its potential impact

The OSTV had not planned a long series of TPT programs, such as the water series, for the 1976-77 school year. Moreover, only a very limited number of short series (two to three broadcasts) had been programmed at the beginning of this school year. Past experience[13] had taught us that OSTV was not able to maintain the original programming due to financial and production difficulties. But because we wanted to field test the impact of a TPT series we could not but choose two short series with a distinct content: Three programs on animal husbandry, scheduled at the end of January and the beginning of February 1977[14], and two programs on (human) vaccination to be broadcast at the end of March 1977.

For several reasons the two program series did not respond to our desires concerning the impact elements of the programs and the time period required for impact to be observed. In general, when preparing the survey instruments we had too little information about the precise contents of both series. There were some preparatory documents and minutes of preparatory meetings which contained the general objectives of the series and some indications about how these objectives were to be "translated" into film images and commentary, but there were no detailed film scripts which could have provided the elements of the possible impact.

The general objective of the animal husbandry series was to make the Ivorian population aware of the advantages of well-organized livestock raising in terms of domestic meat production and consumption and their profitable financial returns. It also wanted to show how the different types of animals, cattle, pigs, chickens, sheep, etc., should be raised properly. The four animal husbandry programs which were to become the

"experimental treatment", dealt with the general issue of livestock raising in the country, and with such specific themes as the construction of a corral or pen, the raising of chickens and the treatment of sick animals.

When formulating the pre-questionnaire we did not know which animal husbandry programs were to be broadcast in the period between the two surveys. Therefore, we were obliged to have rather general and unspecific questions dealing with animal husbandry and, consequently, most of the questions (Q. 30-40 of the individual pre-questionnaire) dealt with the general attitude (awareness) of the respondent towards the problems and prospects of livestock raising and with some knowledge concerning animal treatment rather than with actions. Moreover, even if we had known beforehand what kind of actions the series would advocate, it would have been impossible to assess their action impact because of the short time period - three months - between the series and the post-survey.

The general objectives of the vaccination programs, of which two had been scheduled in the beginning of the school year, were to make the population aware of the necessity of regular vaccination and of its beneficial rather than harmful effects. The absence of a detailed film script precluded any very specific question concerning vaccination to be included in the pre-questionnaire. And the fact that even at the end of the 1976-77 school year the programs had not been produced meant that they were not included as part of the experimental treatment.

It must be noted here that prior to the formulation of the questionnaire, we had interviews with Mr. Kamagate of the SODEPRA and Dr. Koffi of the "Institut D'Hygiène De Treichville" concerning the contents of both TPT series. Although both institutions were the official "sponsors" and technical advisersto the two series, it appeared that neither Dr. Koffi nor

Mr. Kamagate had a very clear idea of what the content of the TV programs was to be. Moreover, although the OSTV requests from its sponsors that they instruct their field agents about the TPT programs that they have requested, and that they organize a kind of campaign around them, it appeared to us that in this respect nothing had been undertaken. Therefore, the absence of field activities would certainly limit the potential effect of the two TV series, the impact of which was going to take place through watching the telecasts and the animated discussions afterwards.

On the basis of these circumstances it could not be expected that large effects in terms of awareness, knowledge and action, would show up, and this certainly influenced the decision to abandon the original research design and to omit repeating the January animal husbandry questions during the post-survey for the entire sample.

2.5.3. The survey period

The choice of the survey period depended not only on the availability of an "experimental treatment" as described in the preceding section, but also on the following considerations:

- The surveys should not be during a school holiday because then the school director and the TPT animator whose collaboration was needed, could be absent.
- The surveys should be at such a time that the young men who go elsewhere for agricultural labor would already have left the village. This would avoid the problem of having interviewed people in January who could not be relocated again in April.
- The villages should be accessible by car, which meant that the visits had to take place before the start of the rainy season (April - May).

After a preparation period of two months the pre-survey was done in the two-and-a half week period of January 5 to January 21, 1977, and the post-survey was conducted in the three week period of April 13 to May 2, 1977.

In order to cover all the villages sampled in a relatively short time span, and taking into account the total number of available research personnel, their familiarity with certain regions, the number of available vehicles and budgetary limitations, two survey teams of different size, one with five and another with three team members, were formed. Both teams were to follow different itineriaries: one to the North-East and East of the country, and one to the North, the West and the Center of the country. In January both teams were headed by an expatriate researcher, while an Ivorian national became head in April. For the itineraries, see the map on page 45.

How the actual surveys were prepared and carried out is discussed in the following sections. There some critical issues are also raised concerning survey work in the Ivorian setting.

2.5.4. Survey preparation

For a larger possibility of success with our field survey, a two week preparatory mission was undertaken in November 1976. Two teams of two researchers were dispatched to contact Sub-Prefects, Primary School Inspectors, Village Chiefs and Village School Directors in order to obtain their advice and cooperation for the research effort to be undertaken. Also, the nature and the location of the villages selected were checked against the sampling criteria (see Section 2.3.1.). This was important because, for example, in two instances it was discovered that villages which according to the official

——— WEST ITINERARY

— — — EAST ITINERARY

TV SCHOOLS ●

NON-TV SCHOOLS ○

TOWNS ○

lists did not have a TV school were in fact TV villages.

One month prior to the pre-survey and also one month before the post-survey officially endorsed letters were sent to the Sub-Prefects and the Primary School Inspectors in whose "territory" the villages and the schools were located, and to the village chief, the school director and the local Party secretary. In many instances those preparatory actions facilitated the research task, especially with respect to obtaining village cooperation and finding food and lodging for the researchers. However, it should be noted that on several occasions cooperation of the official authorities was not only absent but there was direct obstruction. This seriously hampered the data collection, and it may have had some indirect but negative effect on the quality of the data.

While the activities described relate to the immediate survey execution, there were several other preparations needed for formulating the instruments and determining the sampling procedure. The preparatory documents of the TV program series chosen as "experimental treatment" were studied and interviews were held with the film directors and the content experts (see also Section 2.5.2.). Unfortunately, at the moment of the survey preparations not one TV program was finished nor were complete film scripts available[15]. This fact seriously hampered the formulation of adequate and valid questions related to animal husbandry and vaccination. And this, in turn, undoubtedly had repercussions on the quality and the quantity of the responses received during the survey itself.

A third preparation consisted of requesting the TPT animators in the 16 TV villages to hold a "census" among their audience in order to have a list of TPT spectators among whom potential respondents could be sampled (see also Section 2.3.3. and Section 2.5.6.).

2.5.5. Interview training

Given the limited time period for interviewing, it was necessary that as many interviewers as possible were available. The Evaluation Service itself had three national and two expatriate personnel, and three additional Ivorian interviewers were "loaned" to the Service by the OSTV department. Out of these eight persons, only the expatriates had prior survey research experience. Two of the six Ivorians had participated in an interviewer training workshop of one week in April 1976, and had assisted interviewing villagers in early 1976[16]. It was thought that not all the 22 villages could be visited by these eight people within a three week period. Therefore, and because of their prior interview training in April 1976[17], the nine Conseillers Pédagogiques or ACRIS, who were at the disposal of the Evaluation Service were asked to do the interviewing in one TV village each (see Section 2.3.1.).

The training of the research team members consisted of participating in the discussions about and the formulation of the questionnaires, and in the pretesting of the instruments. No formal training was given, but the work they were to do was to be under supervision of the expatriate researchers who had training and who accompanied each team. The training of the ACRIS consisted only of instructing them how to sample their respondents and how to use the instruments. These instructions took place during the survey journey in January 1977. Then the ACRIS were handed the survey material and were instructed about the time period in which to perform their task. One ACRI, who was contacted at the end of the interview period in January, just before the broadcasting of the scheduled animal husbandry programs, was assisted in his work by regular research team members.

Our experience with the ACRIS' work in January was rather negative.

First, few ACRIS returned the completed questionnaires immediately after they had finished their work. It took a number of letters and even a personal visit to obtain all the survey material from them. Secondly, when going over their questionnaires, we found that in a number of cases the ACRI had requested or charged someone else - either a school pupil or a school teacher - to do the interviewing for him. We also suspect that in one or two cases the ACRI just filled out the questionnaire without doing the actual interview. To avoid similar problems during the post-survey it was decided that in April our own interview teams would do all the interviewing, even in the villages where an ACRI was officially in charge. This gave us a check on the comparability and reliability of the first data gathered.

The problems with the ACRIS and also problems experienced with our own research teams in the field point, once more, to the necessity of a basic and thorough training of interviewers in the use of survey techniques. Their capability and experience become the more important when the interviewer is asked to pass judgments and to make decisions in difficult field conditions. We are also aware of the fact that the supervision of the interviewers during their field work was not close enough, and this aspect should be reconsidered in future research.

The next section describes the process of the actual interview.

2.5.6. The interview

A typical village visit would go as follows: The interview team or the ACRI would first pay a courtesy visit to the Sub-Prefect, who was notified in advance by letter, and -- if possible -- to the Primary School Inspector, the Evaluation Service being a service of the Ministry of Primary and Television Education. Accompanied or not by the Sub-Prefect the team

would go to the village where the chief and the elders were convened. After the usual greeting ceremonies the goal of the visit was explained, and in order to give a taste of what an interview and of what the interview situation was like, the village chief and the elders were questioned concerning village matters. Usually, when the Sub-Prefect did not accompany the research team, the contact with the chief was made through the local school director. It was through him or the village council that lodging for the researchers was arranged in case the interviewing would take more than one day.

Ivorian hospitality almost always provided the meals for the interviewers. In order to thank the village population and the school director and his colleagues for their hospitality and cooperation, at the end of each visit tokens of gratitude: money, spirits or kola nuts, were offered by the team.

In those cases where a second (non-TV) village was close to the village visited, the whole team or part thereof would go and contact its chief and make the necessary interview arrangements immediately after the preliminary contacts in the first village.

Except for food and lodging the necessary preparations consisted of determining the number and names of the various neighborhoods and the names of their chiefs; determining the availability and the names of interpreters, one for each interviewer. In a few cases one or several national interviewers did not need an interpreter because they spoke the local languages themselves.

Then each interviewer was assigned to one or more neighborhoods. He received the quota of persons to be interviewed, and with the neighborhood chief and the interpreter he went through the area to identify his

respondents. After this he started the interviews.

A complicating factor in filling the quota was the necessity that at least about half of the respondents had to be more or less regular TPT spectators. During the survey preparations it was thought that identification of TPT viewers could be facilitated by having a list of the spectators in each sample village prepared beforehand. Therefore, in November 1976 the animator in these villages was requested to do a "census" among his spectators during three TPT sessions. On the basis of these lists, returned by only 8 out of 16 animators, we were able to identify certain people whose characteristics corresponded with the quota requirements. But once arrived in the village it was virtually impossible to locate the selected spectators. Either they were absent, or they did not exist (the animator having invented their names), or they had never watched a TPT broadcast, etc. After realizing that selecting respondents on the basis of these spectator lists introduced another bias into our sampling procedure, we tried to include TV spectators by asking potential respondents whether they sometimes watched televison in the local schoolhouse. Because TV watching is something else than TPT participation, it limited the number of TPT spectators in the actual sample below the number anticipated.

At the start of the interview, not only the name, the sex and the age of the respondent were recorded, but also his neighborhood and the name of the neighborhood chief. Thus, it became less difficult to relocate the respondent for the post-interview three months later in April. Interviewers were instructed not to mention TPT as the main focus of the interview and not to mention the post-survey in order to avoid that respondents would "invent" answers related to TPT and would be induced to watch (more frequently than usual) TPT programs between January and April.

Another possible research bias was located in the need for having the questionnaires translated into the local language of the village. Some notes concerning this problem are presented in Section 2.5.7.

2.5.7. Translation and interpreters

The population of the Ivory Coast, outside the many foreign peoples who live there, is composed of at least 50 different ethnic groups. The origins of many of these groups can be traced and linked to about 5 to 10 main groups, but the fact remains that their existence creates a huge linguistic diversity. Ethnic groups and linguistic sub-groups can be large or small but in terms of numbers no one group is clearly dominant. This does not exclude, for example, that large ethnic groups such as the Baoulé and the Agni, both belonging to the larger Akan group, do not understand each other's language, but there are major differences. This is the reason why, for instance, the Ivorian radio, despite the fact that it has some broadcasts in 13 different regional languages, does not reach all the Ivorians in their own language.

This situation, which was reflected in the composition of the actual sample in which at least 7 main ethnic groups comprising many different sub-groups were included, and the fact that the Ivorian research team members knew only relatively few different local languages, excluded from the beginning that the questionnaires were formulated in any of the regional languages. Questions were in French, and during the questionnaire preparation, efforts were made to have their formulation as simple as possible and to check the translation of certain formulations against the local languages the team members knew. This does not exclude that certain notions in the questionnaire were difficult to translate, or that because of cultural and linguistic differences in the various regions, notions were not understood

or were misunderstood by the respondents. Thus, a reliability bias was introduced.

Once arrived in the village, it was not always easy to find able interpreters. Usually there were a number of people who knew some French. But in our case we needed people who also understood their role in an interview situation. Evidently, such people are rare, and therefore we sometimes had to be satisfied with someone who understood and spoke only basic French. Besides, because of his status as intermediary between the respondent (and thus the village) and the interviewer (the outside world, the government), the interpreter thought it sometimes to be his duty to clarify instead of translate, and thus modify the response, or to answer a question even before it had been translated or before the respondent had had time to think of an answer.

It will be clear that under these circumstances data gathering itself becomes a difficult task, but also that the reliability of the data is negatively affected. This is one more reason why in the analysis stage care must be taken in interpreting the research findings.

2.6. Conclusion

In this chapter we have discussed the development of the research design and the sampling design, the creation of the research instruments and the preparation and execution of the actual surveys. We have seen that the original research objectives called for a quasi-experimental survey design, but there were theoretical and practical reasons why in the course of this study this design was abandoned. We also have indicated many of the actual field conditions which affected and constrained our original research intentions, the data gathering process, and the nature and quality of the data.

Two lessons are exemplified by the foregoing sections. One, despite the most sophisticated theoretical knowledge of research requirements and pitfalls, theory always falls short of reality, and thus field research, especially in a developing country, has to deal with many unknown, uncommon and "distorting" factors. Two, consequently, the research findings to be presented in Chapters Four, Five, Six and Seven must be interpreted from the perspective of the context in which they were collected. They have more qualitative flavor rather than quantitative rigor, they indicate tendencies and patterns rather than statistical truths which can be generalized to all Ivorians, to all Ivorian villages or to the total TPT operation.

With this in mind, we now turn to the description of the actual sample in Chapter Three.

REFERENCES

1. See Campbell and Stanley, 1966 : 13-16.
2. Where O stands for observation or measurement and X stands for the intervention or treatment, in this case, watching TPT.
3. ACRIS (Agent Chargé de Receuil d'Information) are Pedagogical Advisers. Each Primary School Inspector has a certain number of these Advisers who supervise and counsel the primary school teachers, especially in pedagogical matters. Since 1975 these Advisers have been used for performing educational evaluation activities. Nine of them followed a training seminar in survey techniques in April 1976.
4. Lenglet and McAnany, 1977. These are national figures. There is variation in audience numbers in TV villages. This means that there are TV villages with almost no TPT spectators, while there are others with an overage of 50 to 100 spectators per TPT session.
5. Sampling constraints create major obstacles for doing survey research in developing countries, especially when probabilistic sampling (instead of non-probabilistic sampling) is desired. There exist certain techniques for identifying farms or households but individual sampling is virtually impossible. See for a good discussion of this issue Kearle (1976), especially pp. 27-49.
6. Hursch-César and Roy, 1976 : 191.
7. "Young" in Ivorian society does not stand so much for a certain age but rather for a certain social position. The age group of 25-45 years can be easily included in this category. Previous research indicates that this age group provides a relatively large number of TPT spectators. Therefore our choice to "over-select" this age group in the sample does not run counter to the research finding that the "young" are over-represented among the TPT audience.

8. This questionnaire is reproduced as Appendix A.

9. This means Question 41.

10. See also Seya and Yao, 1977.

11. This questionnaire is reproduced as Appendix B.

12. The SIKATIO programs were primarily oriented towards the urban audience. On request of the OSTV, we included some questions about it in our post-questionnaire. Analysis of the responses was done by the TPT department and is reported elsewhere.

13. See, for example, Kaye and Lenglet, 1975.

14. As a matter of fact, three programs out of this series were telecast before the pre-survey. Four were broadcast at the end of January and February 1977, while two remaining animal husbandry programs were shown in May and June, 1977. Why the programs were dispersed over such a long period is not clear. It may have been due to chronic financial and production difficultures of the OSTV. See Appendix C for the broadcasting dates of the animal husbandry series.

15. This seems to be a common practice. First, film directors work only with schematic scripts, and secondly, TPT films are only finished a couple of days or even a couple of hours before broadcasting time.

16. This was done for the study by Benveniste (1976).

17. For the media survey reported in Seya and Yao, 1977.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE VILLAGES AND RESPONDENTS

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter we will present a description of the villages selected for the survey, while also making comparisons between TV and non-TV villages. The description not only provides the background against which the findings of impact, audience composition and attitudes about TPT gain significance, but it reveals some of the crucial factors which intervene and explain some of the outcome measures.

In the past it has been observed that, for example, educated people participate relatively more in the TPT sessions than people without education. Thus, education may be a factor in explaining who watches TV or TPT and who does not, and also who starts an action as the result of having watched TPT. There are other variables such as age, income, ethnic affiliation, etc. To a certain extent these individual characteristics are linked to the place where people live: the region, the village. As we explained in Section 2.3.1. the region of a village coincides to a large degree with level of personal income, ethnic affiliation and religion. But there are other village characteristics which, although they do not immediately affect individual traits, influence especially the action impact of the TPT programs. The material endowment of the village, the level of material development, its "modernity", have, first, an impact on the presence and seriousness of certain development problems dealt with by TPT (for example, water supply, health, agriculture), and, secondly, form the pre-conditions for decisions and actions to "solve" these problems. For example, in a poor Moslem village, the youth who watches TPT will probably have a hard time

convincing the elders of the necessity of constructing a well, and to raise money to start the construction. It is apparent that some villages form a better environment for possible TPT impact than others, and that some individuals are in a better position to become aware of development problems or to start action than others.

3.2. The sample villages

3.2.1. Introduction

In Section 2.3.1., we presented the criteria for selecting the 22 villages in which 600 respondents were to be sampled. Appendix D provides a list of the names of these villages, their Department, Sub-Prefecture, and Primary School Inspectorate. Also indicated are their total number of inhabitants, divided by sex, the distance in kilometers to the nearest (small) town and their accessibility by road, as well as the region in which they are located.

3.2.2. Geographical regions

Although the 22 villages are more or less evenly distributed over the three main regions: 8 in the forest, 7 in the wooded savanna and 7 in the savanna, the ratio of TV and non-TV villages per region is rather awkward. We find a 8:3 ratio in the forest, a 9:1 ratio in the wooded savanna, and a 6:4 ratio in the savanna. It probably means that the 16 TV villages as well as the non-TV villages are spread over the three zones according to the distribution of TV and non-TV schools in the country.

3.2.3. Inhabitants

One of the reasons why we included non-TV villages in our sample was that we wanted to find out whether the "living conditions" differed in TV and non-TV villages, and to what extent this could affect the degree and

ways of outside influences such as TPT. Comparing the two groups of villages on some general characteristics we find that on the average the non-TV villages have less inhabitants than the TV villages. TV villages have an average of 1,126 inhabitants while non-TV villages have an average population of 787.

3.2.4. Accessibility

We also find that the average distance between the village and the nearest town is somewhat longer in the case of non-TV villages than in the case of TV villages. Inhabitants of the latter must travel an average of 32.06 kms to reach the nearest town, non-TV villages have to go 38 kms.

What distinguishes the two groups of villages most is the relative ease by which they can be reached, in short: their level of accessibility. Bearing in mind that all villages were also chosen because they were accessible by car, it is still interesting to note that four out of six non-TV villages (67%) against four out of 15 TV villages (27%)[1] have a difficult access.[2] If we give a score of three points when the village is easily accessible, a score of two for a village with somewhat difficult access and a score of one when the access is really difficult, the average score of the TV villages becomes 2.27 and of the non-TV villages 1.5. We do not believe that the fact that the non-TV villages do not have a school equipped with TV receivers is in immediate function of their geographical isolation. (Only one non-TV village did not have a school at all).

However, as we will see in the following paragraphs their inaccessibility certainly plays a role in the degree to which the village (objectively and subjectively) experiences problems in terms of social services, socio-economic infrastructure, in short "development"[3].

3.2.5. Infrastructural innovations

In order to give an idea of the level of "development" in the 22

villages, we present in Appendix E a list of infrastructural institutions which according to Ivorian standards must be considered "modern" and a condition for and indication of "development". This list was compiled by using information gathered during the interviews with the chief and the elders of the villages. The frequencies in the table represent the number of villages falling into the categories of having, not-having or being-in-the-process-of-having such "innovations". What we find - and we feel that this is not atypical for most rural areas of the country - is that all villages have only a limited number of "modern" institutions, with the exception of the primary school. That all except one village had a school is not surprising because the presence of a school with or without TV was one of the sampling criteria.

The most widespread element of infrastructure is a well, i.e., a drilled well equipped with a (manual) water pump. More than half of the villages have at least one or were constructing one[4]. Another more common modern implementation is the lotissement or rezoning. Rezoning implies the creation of rectangular building lots and the tracing of streets in traditional villages where the layout is very different. Forty percent of the villages were already rezoned or were in a rezoning process. Rezoning is the prerequisite for the construction of more modern houses as well as for having electricity and (in the future) piped water. More than half of the villages have some kind of agricultural cooperative (officially recognized as such or not) or are in the process of creating one. Usually this cooperative functions only for marketing of crops grown on individual (family) plantations. There are very few production cooperatives in the country.

What is really striking is the almost complete absence of a health institution in the 22 villages. There is only one dispensary but no

maternities, though 8 out of 22 villages are more or less regularly visited by public or private (missionary) health personnel[5]. This leaves about 14 villages (64%) without any regular institutionalized health care, and at this point the village accessibility and closeness to town becomes even more important. The closer the village is to the nearest dispensary or hospital and the easier it is to travel there by public transportation, the less will be the urgency of having one's own health facilities.

When comparing the presence of certain innovations in TV and non-TV villages, there is no immediate and apparent difference. This could be due to the relatively small numbers of both groups, and in particular of the non-TV group. But we feel that on the average both groups are equally (un)developed. This does not exclude that some villages have a more modern infrastructure than others. There is a range of only one innovation per village to five innovations per village, which means that there are villages which, except for a small schoolhouse, have no modern institutions at all.

In this respect we tried to develop a "modernity" index on which the 22 villages could be rank-ordered according to the volume and quality of their modern infrastructure. The absence of information in a number of villages on the quality of the innovations and the number of years it existed, did not allow us to do so. But if we exclude the presence of a cooperative or a youth center, and if we give one point to the presence of any other "innovation" and a half point to any "institution" which is "under construction" we find that non-TV villages have on the average two modern institutions while the TV villages have 2.22. This may be an indication of the somewhat higher level of (material) development in the second group, but the small numbers limit any immediate conclusion.

Not only the degree of (un)development is important in explaining why certain villages seem to have a higher TPT impact than others or have a different audience profile, but perhaps even more crucial becomes the way modern institutions are introduced into the village. Therefore, we asked the village chiefs who had taken the initiative to have a modern institution, and who had financed its implementation. In Appendex F, we present the aggregate answers for all the villages broken down for TV and non-TV villages.

For more than half of the 9 innovations studied and usually in more than two-thirds of the 22 villages the initiative lies with the village council, one or more villagers or village "intellectuals" living in urban areas away from home[6]. But we also observe that there are variations per "innovation". Thus it seems that most schools are established on village initiative while for many wells the Government, through the administrative authorities or government agencies, has taken the initiative. The picture is different for the financing. More than half of the wells are financed by the Government. This is possibly true for many of the wells constructed before 1974. Since then the large national Government water projects request a financial participation of the village in drilling a well. The usual village contribution, based on individual cotisations, amounts to 150,000 CFA Francs (or U.S. $610.00). Sixty to seventy percent of the schools are, however, financed by the village itself and its "intellectuals" and the villagers themselves have paid almost all rezoning projects.

As far as the financing of development projects is concerned, there does not seem to be a difference between TV and non-TV villages. With respect to the initiative for development projects the picture is also rather similar for both groups, though wells in non-TV villages seem to have been started with more Government initiative than in TV villages. However, the absolute

numbers are small, and therefore care should be taken in interpreting the percentages.

3.2.6. Development problems

From the foregoing paragraphs it is clear that many of the 22 sample villages lack a modern infrastructure adequate to basic human needs. Two-fifths of the villages do not have any source of potable water, which means that their inhabitants are daily exposed to a serious health hazard. And here we do not speak of other health hazards such as free roaming animals and the absence of drainage systems. Almost no village has a health care institution, while at the same time many of the villages have difficult access to the nearest town. If health would be the only criterion we could already conclude that basic human needs in many of the villages are not adequately met.

But the lack of a modern infrastructure in the 22 villages should not be interpreted as a lack of initiative or "want" or "demand". According to the interviews we had with the village leaders it seems that there are many problems which are identified as "urgent" in the villages. But the villages have not yet found the ways and the means for solving them. The identification of these problems and the obstacles the villages experience in improving the material situation of the village becomes important when trying to asses to what extent TPT can create an awareness of development issues among the peasant population. It is possible that important sections of the so-called rural mass are already well aware of these problems but they do not have the means to solve them. Besides, the obstacles for village improvement cannot be solved by villagers acquiring new attitudes, knowledge and habits through information. It may be that the technical, administrative and financial obstacles which impede village improvement decisions and actions

are of a more structural and political-economic nature[7], and can only be affected by political and economic changes on the level of the nation state.

In Appendix G, we present the complete list of "most urgent problems" as expressed by the village leaders. We see that three-fourths of all villages see health care - the creation of a dispensary or maternity - as the most acute problem. This need is more widely felt in non-TV villages than in TV villages, perhaps because the former have more difficult access to towns.

Water supply (wells, piped water, irrigation) is the second most urgent problem expressed by village chiefs, and, again, it seems to be more serious for non-TV than for TV villages.

A third problem concerns the physical access to villages because of the bad state of roads and bridges. Half of the non-TV and a quarter of the TV villages request road improvement and the construction of stone bridges. The question of rezoning and improvement of streets and drainage is a fourth urgent need, while the fifth one concerns the completion or extension of the school (or in several cases, the construction of housing for the school teachers).

Here it is interesting to note the similarity in rank-order of the main problems as mentioned by the village elders on the one hand and by the respondents of the individual questionnaires on the other. One hundred and sixty-two persons answered the question of what they felt the main problem in their village was (Question 42, April). One fourth of them mentioned health (the lack of a dispensary) as the main problem. Water and housing were mentioned by 24.7 percent, while "money" (most likely the lack thereof) was brought up by 11.7 percent of the respondents. The first three rank-order

positions of the individual responses correspond to those of the village list: (1) health, (2) water, (3) housing. This could be seen as the existence of a large consensus in the village with regard to the immediate development problems. And therefore it seems that no particular effort need be made to make the village population aware of them.

This latter point needs some extra attention because the TPT programs are especially aimed at making the population aware of development problems and what can be done about them. In French this awareness creation is called sensibilisation. It has been observed that 80 to 95 percent of all TPT programs contain a sensibilisation objective[8]. And research findings seem to indicate that especially in terms of sensibilisation, as opposed to action, the TPT programs have some impact[9] (see also Chapter VI).

A comparison of these results with the observation that villagers are well aware of the most urgent development problems would indicate that if something needs to be done in terms of education or information for the rural areas, it should be a program showing how other villagers have solved similar problems, and indicating the ways and means to solve them. As we have said before, such information will not have any effect if these ways and means are not present, or only available to a limited group of people and through slow and tortuous bureaucratic channels[10].

When looking at the number of urgent problems mentioned by the village leaders we see that each village mentions on the average 2.22 problems. However, there is a difference between TV and non-TV villages. The latter experience an average of 2.83 problems and the former an average of 2.25. This could be an indication that non-TV villages are more "underdeveloped" or "backward" than TV villages.

3.2.7. Obstacles to village improvement

Although the level of material development is important in explaining a possible TPT impact and the TPT audience profile, we feel that the obstacles to improving the development level of the village may be even more crucial for TPT's potential impact, especially in terms of decision-making and the undertaking of actions. Some of these obstacles have already been touched upon in previous paragraphs.

Responses of 15 village leaders concerning the obstacles to village improvement can be hierarchically classified in four main categories: financial, administrative, technical and "cultural", the first category containing more responses than the second, and so forth.

The financial category can be equated with the lack of money. It is the main obstacle for any improvement action in all villages, though it is the almost exclusive response category in the non-TV villages. There money is either completely absent, and thus forbids any improvement, or it takes a long time -- while waiting for the growth and the sale of the crops -- to collect the necessary funds to start an action. Chiefs mention, for example, that a well or school cannot be constructed, or that a well cannot be equipped with a pump, or that the village has not yet been rezoned because the village lacks the necessary finances. To a certain extent the lack of cash may in part be due to the rural exodus (see below, Section 3.2.9.) of the young and the able men, which limits the quantity and the quality of agricultural production, and thus limits the potential of generating cash income. But the remark is also made that, even when money is available, and when a village collection is made, the administrative authorities do not honor this local initiative and do not provide the requested services.

This brings us to the second obstacle category: administrative. Among the answers we find that village initiatives are not responded to by expedient administrative action. This means that either no action at all is undertaken or that the bureaucratic process takes so long that improvements are started many years after the date of the original request.

The technical obstacles mentioned, for example, would be that drilling for a well took more time than originally foreseen. "Cultural" obstacles (for lack of a better word) refer to the three villages where a dispute existed within the village or between two neighboring villages about the place where the new school should be constructed.

A last unclassified obstacle mentioned is the inaccessibility of the village. This hampers the transportation of persons and also of construction material for the new school.

It seems to us that these obstacles can only be removed by TPT to a very limited degree. This does not exclude the possibility that TPT, or similar educational and information programs, plays a facilitating role in the political and economic change process[11].

3.2.8. Field agents

In previous reports it had been remarked that there was little or no cooperation between the TPT animators and the agents of the development agencies who had "sponsored" a TPT program, although the need for such cooperation has been emphasized many times. Therefore we wanted to know whether field agents were working in the village, and whether the TPT animator had any contact with them when animating the TPT programs.

In January we asked the chief about the kinds and numbers of field agents of the various State Development Companies and other state agencies who paid visits or lived in their village. We found that almost 20 percent of all

our sample villages are never visited (see Appendix H). Fifty percent see one or two agents, while the remaining 30 percent (7 villages) are visited by three, five or even six agents. It is interesting to note that health agents are the most common (8 villages). Next come agents of the large agricultural development companies such as the CIDT, SODEPRA, SATMACI and SODERIZ.

3.2.9. Rural exodus

Because the TPT programs also intend to reach the primary school leavers, drop-outs and young adults to stem the rural exodus, we were interested to know how this phenomenon was perceived by the various village chiefs. We found that a large number of villages (19) experience this problem. Although many of the village leaders (11) believe that the emigration of their most able young men is detrimental for the village and affects their prosperity and survival, 4 chiefs feel that the exodus is beneficial because the emigrées send money back which allows those who remain to make new investments in agriculture and trade. This last attitude prevails in the Dioula villages where there is a long tradition of emigration, as well as re-immigration. In the non-Dioula villages the exodus creates much more serious effects because it is permanent, thus destroying the basis for the reproduction of village society.

3.2.10. Conclusion

The foregoing sections have provided an idea of the socio-economic situation in the 22 sample villages. They are relatively underdeveloped in terms of material infrastructure, there are many obstacles in improving this situation, and the absence of field agents and the persistent rural exodus do not lend themselves to immediate solution.

The sections that follow will be devoted to describe the individual sample of 601 respondents in terms of their basic socio-economic characteristics.

3.3. The individual respondents

3.3.1. Introduction

Having seen the village characteristics which form the context and pre-conditions for a potential TPT impact and the way villages participate in TPT, we will describe in this section a number of socio-economic characteristics of the individual sample which impinge on people's perceptions, attitudes, and behavior. Therefore, they are potential explanatory or independent variables of TPT impact in terms of attitude change, knowledge acquisition and action-decisions. We will compare the distribution of the various variables in the original theoretical sample, the January sample and the April sample. The comparision between the theoretical and January distribution is important in order to determine whether the quota sampling technique provided the expected results. As we will see, it did. Because the post-questionnaire contained questions the answers to which were to be compared with answers during the pre-survey, it seemed essential that the basic distribution of basic respondent characteristics remained identical for both surveys. As a matter of fact, it did.

3.3.2. The original and the actual sample

The original sample of individuals called for 600 respondents, 30 in each TV village and 20 in each non-TV village. Thus, in theory there were 480 TV villagers and 120 non-TV villagers who would be divided by the following criteria: TPT spectators or not, sex, and age (see Table 1).

In general we succeeded in filling the theoretical quotas during the January survey, while the absence of 19 percent of the original respondents during the April survey did not affect the January sample distribution

in any significant way. In Tables 1, 2, and 3 we present the frequency distribution of the main sample criteria in (1) the theoretical sample, (2) the January sample, (3) the relocated respondents in April and (4) the April absentees. The Tables do not need further explanation. It appears that the interviewers managed to a very large extent to fill their assigned quotas, and that the drop-out between January and April did not distort the original weighting in the January survey. There is a major anomaly, however, between the theoretical and the January sample: the difference between the proportions of spectators and non-spectators. In a previous section (2.3.3.) we explained our intention to have at least 50 percent TPT spectators among the respondents. To this end we asked prior to the survey the TPT animators in the 16 TV villages to compile a list of their spectators, on the basis of which potential TPT spectators could be identified. This strategy failed because of the unreliable information it yielded. Therefore we were obliged during the filling of the respondent quotas to ask potential respondents whether they watched television or not (TPT as such was not specified). If the answer was "yes" and if they responded to the other quota criteria they were included in the sample. But it is clear that watching TV is not the same as watching TPT (see also Chapters IV and V) and thus the proportion of actual TPT spectators differed considerably from the proportion aimed at. Instead of a fifty-fifty distribution, 40 percent TV spectators and 60 percent non-spectators were sampled in January.

The theoretical sample, the January sample, the April sample and the group of April absentees not only show more or less similar distributions on the variables of sex and age but also on region, profession, membership in cultural or cooperative associations, income, social status, religion,

TABLE 3-1

The total number of respondents in the theoretical sample, the January and April surveys, and among the April absentees in TV and non-TV villages.

	Theoretical sample		January		April		Absentees	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	600	-	601	-	487		114	-
TV Village	480	80	479	79.7	383	78.6	96	84.2
Non-TV Village	120	20	122	20.3	184	21.4	18	15.8

TABLE 3-2

Distribution of TV village respondents in the theoretical sample and the January and April surveys according to sex, TV watching and age. (N = 480)

	Theoretical sample (N = 480)		January (N = 479)		April (N = 383)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	320	66.6	319	66.6	255	66.6
Female	160	33.3	160	33.4	128	33.4
TPT spectators*	240	50	194	40.5	157	41
Non-TPT* spectators	240	50	285	59.5	226	59
15-25 years	160	33.3	152	31.7	109	28.5
26-45 years	224	46.7	218	45.5	177	46.2
46 years and older	96	20	109	22.8	97	25.3

* Actually in January and April there were TV and non-TV spectators instead of TPT and non-TPT spectators (see Section 3.3.2.).

TABLE 3-3

Distribution of non-TV respondents in the theoretical sample and the January and April surveys according to sex, TV watching and age. (N = 120)

	Theoretical sample (N = 120)		January (N = 12])		April (N = 104)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	84	70	84	68.9	71	68.3
Female	36	30	38	31.1	33	31.7
TV spectators	?	--	77	63.1	65	62.5
Non-TV spectators	?	--	45	36.9	39	37.5
15-25 years	42	35	38	31.1	33	31.7
26-45 years	60	50	65	53.3	56	53.8
46 years and older	18	15	19	15.6	15	14.4

education and ethnic affiliation. This does not mean that the proportions for TV and non-TV villages on all the variables were similar. We will not dwell on this point. It is, however, interesting to note that from the beginning there were some differences between the two groups of villagers concerning the basic independent variables.

3.3.3. Region

The first difference we noted between the characteristics of TV and non-TV villagers was that both groups were unevenly distributed over the three regions. Although TV villagers comprised 80 percent of the sample and non-TV villagers 20 percent, the ratio of these two groups in the forest region was 91:9, in the wooded savanna zone 78:22 and in the savanna 67:33.

What we have observed in Section 2.3.1. is confirmed here: the more one goes to the North (the savanna) the less TV village respondents one is going to encounter.

3.3.4. Sex and age

The sex distribution for TV villages and non-TV villages is almost identical, as was our intention. Although we had a similar intention for age, we observe in our data that in the non-TV villages the older age group is, percentage-wise, smaller than in the TV villages, while the age group of 26 to 45 years is somewhat larger.

3.3.5. Profession

The profession of our respondents was not a surprise to us. In Table 4 we see that with very slight variations in TV and non-TV villages the large majority of the respondents, 47 percent, are "planter": a peasant who is mainly cultivating cash crops like coffee and cocoa. However, 13 percent of the TV villagers were "cultivator", who, in comparison with the "planter" cultivates less cash crops, while in the non-TV villages 24 percent said that they were "cultivator". This difference is immediately explained by the fact that most of the non-TV villages are in the North, where more subsistance than cash crops predominate in contrast to Center and Southern regions. About 23 percent of the respondents were ménagères, or housewives, a category which is almost automatically filled by all female respondents.

The housewife profession in a country like the Ivory Coast certainly includes many more (diverse) activities than the western notion of "housewife" conveys. Housewives are not only responsible for raising children, preparing food and keeping the house, but they perform major agricultural tasks, haul water and gather firewood, and have often a little trade in small agricultural products (tomatoes, dried smoked fish, yams, etc.).

TABLE 3-4

Distribution of respondents' professions in TV and non-TV villages in January

	TV Village		Non-TV Village	
	N	%	N	%
Planter	227	48.2	56	46.7
Cultivator	63	13.4	29	24.2
Housewife	113	24.0	28	23.3
Other profession and jobless	68	14.1	7	5.8
Total	471	100.0	120*	100.0

* Non-responses have been excluded

A small minority of the respondents reported "other professions", such as day laborer, field agent, transporter, trader, and "jobless", but their number is so small that we do not consider them separately in our analysis.

3.3.6. Membership in associations

Membership in a cultural or sports association is not completely proportionate to the TV-non-TV distribution. There are relatively more association members in the TV than in the non-TV villages. But it is also interesting to note that the non-response category in the latter group is proportionally smaller than in the former. With regard to membership in a youth group or cooperative, the picture is different. In the non-TV villages there are relatively more members than in the TV villages. This can possibly be explained by the stronger initiation traditions in the northern, mostly Moslem, villages. But again, non-responses are more frequent in the latter than in the former group.

3.3.7. Income

Some particular attention must be devoted to the question of "income". Even in industrialized societies income is a difficult concept to measure adequately. It becomes even more difficult in countries with a large agricultural base, where money income forms only a limited part of the family "budget", especially in those areas where only limited cash crop production, and thus marketing, takes place. This does not exclude the fact that even in those areas there are people (individuals or families) with relatively large cash incomes. And it is certain that the amount of money at one's disposal is an indication of a person's social and economic status. As in any other society money wields power, and in a society like the Ivory Coast where economic growth, increased productivity and individual entrepreneurship are stressed as positive contributions to national development, it may be assumed that the level of revenue is a good indicator of the (potential) links with the modern sector, and of the potential of starting "development" oriented actions.

We tried to measure the income of the respondents in January and in April, each time with a somewhat different measure, though their basic form was similar: We asked the respondents whether s/he had sold any agricultural products. For each product we determined the amount, and knowing the official prices per kilo, this amount was converted into CFA Francs. When several products were mentioned their respective amounts were added, and to this was added any other supplementary income from trade or other activities.

There are several problems with this procedure. First, it excludes almost automatically many of the "housewives" who do not have any cash income, and who are dependent on their husbands for their cash needs[12]. Secondly, given the organization of African agriculture, where the extended family,

under the leadership of the father or uncle, tills the soil, young married men are still dependent on the oldest male in the family household. Thus, they do not have any income over which they have discretionary power, although they need money for themselves and their children, for example, for schooling. Thirdly, the method of listing all agricultural crops and recalling how many kilos or tons were grown and sold leaves the opportunity of underestimating or over-reporting by the respondent. Questions about income or production are never popular, and they become even more suspect in situations where the peasant has had bad experiences with the administrative authorities, and where fears of increased taxation are real. This means that the reliability and the validity of the income measure is challenged.

About a quarter of the respondents report no cash income. Another quarter report an annual income between 1 and 50,000 CFA Francs, and a third quarter falls in the 51,000 to 200,000 CFA Francs bracket. Five percent of the respondents do not give an answer, while about 20 percent has more than 200,000 CFA Francs annually.

The differences between the January and April distributions reflect the differences between the January and April measures, the April measure being somewhat more refined than the January one. However, the Pearson-moment correlation between the two measures appears to be relatively high (0.60) indicating that there was a relatively high stability in the way the respondents reported their income. Because statistical calculations showed that there was less variance around the means of each income category for the January measure, we decided to adopt this first measure for further cross-tabulations in the following chapters.

Excluding the non respondents and April absentees, we obtain Table 5 for the January and April respondents.

TABLE 3-5

Annual income distribution of respondents in January and April

	January		April	
	N	%	N	%
Without income	126	28	132	29
1 to 50,000 CFA Francs*	119	26	131	29
51 - 200,000 CFA Francs	129	28	116	24
201,000 CFA Francs and more	85	19	86	19
Total of respondents present in both surveys	459	100	459	100

*250 CFA Francs equals U.S. $1.00.

An additional remark about the two income measures is warranted. Although in January as well as in April we attempted to measure the monetary income of the individual respondents, it is very likely that - certainly in the case of the male respondents - the global family income instead of the individual income was determined. This global family income should probably be divided by the number of household members to approach a more realistic individual income, and thus also more realistic individual income categories. In doing so, the monetary amounts represented by the different income categories would come closer to those accepted by the Ivorian Ministry of Planning. In 1973 the average annual monetary income per capita in the rural areas was 14,000 CFA Francs, excluding auto-consumption (DATAR, 1975).

Even allowing for inflation and possible real income gains, it is apparent that our estimates are not too realistic. This remark should be borne in mind when we will discuss income differences as they affect TV or TPT watching and TPT impact.

3.3.8. Social Status

In order to determine the social status of the respondent his/her position in the village hierarchy was noted. The large majority of the respondents were "ordinary citizens". About 12 percent (somewhat less in the non-TV villages) were "authorities". This distribution reflects the decision by the research team to interview only a small number of village elders commensurate with their actual number in the village.

3.3.9. Religion

Although the distribution of the major "religions" among the respondents seems to correspond to the national distribution of "religions" there is a large difference between the TV and non-TV groups. While there are more Animists and Christians in the TV villages, the Moslems are "over-represented" in the non-TV villages. This, again, corresponds to the location of these latter villages: The North, where almost everybody is Moslem, while in the Center and the South of the country, the Christians and Animists are more dominant.

3.3.10. Ethnic affiliation

The North-South distinction is also reflected in the distribution of respondents over the various ethnic groups. The Senoufo, living in the North, are the largest group of respondents (25 percent) but they are in relatively greater numbers found in the non-TV villages. The same is true for the Mandé or Dioula, who are in disproportionately large numbers found in the savanna region, reflecting their region of habitation. The Akan

group, including Baoulé and Agni, and the Dan group, comprising Gouro and Yacouba are more or less evenly spread over the TV village and non-TV village respondents.

3.3.11. Education

Among the factors which could explain part of TPT impact, and audience composition, for example, we were particularly interested in the level of education. There were several questions (Questions 17, 18 and 19, January) asking whether the respondent understood French, spoke French, and what level of formal education s/he had attained. The majority of the respondents (71 percent) declared that they were illiterate and did not speak or understand French. The number of those who did and who had some formal schooling was relatively small: about 12 percent say that they understand and speak French (though this is usually at a low level of sophistication), while about 17 percent reports to have followed formal education. Among these latter only 22 (3.7% of the total number of respondents) have gone as far as the fourth grade in primary school, 16 (2.7%) have passed the secondary school entrance exam, and only 9 (1.5%) have finished part of secondary school.

There are relatively more illiterates in the non-TV villages than in the TV villages, while those with some knowledge of French are "over-represented" in the TV villages. Respondents with some formal education are proportionally distributed over both TV and non-TV groups. The total distribution of the respondents on the education variable is such that the Chi-Square statistic is significant (Chi-square = 10.5 at the .005 level) which mears that there is a high probability that non-TV villages are less educated than TV villages. And this corresponds with the general lower schooling level in the North among the Moslem population.

3.3.12. The April absentees

As explained earlier (see Section 2.4.2.1.) during the January survey precautions were taken to have the identification of the respondents as complete as possible in order to be able to relocate him/her during the post-survey in April. In general, we were rather successful in finding the original respondents (see Table 1). Only 114 people, or 19 percent of the original sample, could not be found. Sixty-two of them had left the village (temporarily) for travel, study or work, while the other 52 were ill, dead or non-existent[13]. Although the number of absentees was relatively low in most of the 22 villges, in 3 villages it was higher than average. Probably not by accident these three villages had been visited in January by three ACRIS who, as has been observed elsewhere (see Section 2.5.5.) had not performed their task as well as expected. Table 6 reveals that younger male respondents were disproportionally absent in April. This means that the young migrants had already left for work at the "Basse Côte". These absentees might have been avoided had the second survey come earlier but circumstances of programming schedule and our study design did not permit this adaptation.

TABLE 3-6

Distribution of April absentees according to sex, TV watching and age

	N	%
Male	77	67.5
Female	37	32.5
	114	100.0

(Continued)

Table 3-6 (Continued)

TV spectators	49	43.0
Non-TV spectators	65	57.0
	114	100.0
15-25 years	48	42.1
26-45 years	50	43.9
46 years and older	16	14.0
Total	114	100.0

3.4. Conclusion

In this chapter we have presented a description of the most important characteristics of sample villages and respondents which could partly explain the ways in which TPT is perceived, the ways in which people participate in TPT sessions, and the potential impact of the TPT programs in terms of awareness creation or sensibilisation, knowledge transmission and action. We have indicated and explained the differences which exist between the theoretical sample distribution and the distribution of the January and April samples in terms of a number of commonly used explanatory variables such as sex, age, religion, socio-economic status, education and the like.

The foregoing sections provide the context within which the research results of the following chapters are to be analyzed and interpreted.

REFERENCES

1. For one TV village we do not have this information because the ACRI who did the interviewing was not visited personally by the researchers.
2. Accessibility is defined in terms of the distance to a major road and the quality of the pavement. Though a large road improvement and pavement program is in execution, the majority of the major roads and almost all secondary and tertiary roads in the country are still unpaved, with a large variation in their quality.
3. According to the company which does the maintenance of the ETV system (CATEL), the official criterion for equipping a school with one or more TV receivers is a sufficiently good technical reception of the TV signal. This does not explain sufficiently why some villages close to a TV school village do not have TV in their own schools.
4. Potable water supply and well construction are at present a major concern of the Government as witnessed from the large-scale national well construction programs. See Lenglet, 1976.
5. See also the following paragraphs about the most urgent village problems.
6. Intellectuals are persons who originating from the village have settled in the urban areas after having completed at least part of secondary education. They usually occupy positions of some influence or they have more money than the average villagers. Therefore they form an important resource (political, financial) for supporting village interests.
7. See Lenglet, 1976.
8. See Lenglet, forthcoming, and Kaye and Lenglet, 1975.
9. See Lenglet, 1976.

10. There are indications that villagers know the channels through which to obtain the necessary inputs for village improvement. But these channels are not official. They exist between the village and its "intellectuals" (see Reference 6). See Cohen, 1973 and Stryker, 1971.

11. For an introductory analysis of this process of state intervention in the rural areas, see Goussault, 1976.

12. It has often been observed that "modernization" of African agriculture increases the dependency of the woman: Efforts of development agencies are directed towards the men who thus become the persons through whom money enters the "traditional" economy. While traditionally women are supposed to take care of themselves and their children, with the monetarization of the economy they lose their "independence" and are pushed into the dependent mother's and housekeeper's role. See, e.g., Pala, 1976. Our findings indicate that 56% of women in January (and 63% in April) say that they have no cash income at all.

13. The non-existence of certain respondents needs some explanation. We assume that some ACRIS have "invented" some respondents during the pre-survey. Thus when during the post-survey members of the regular research teams tried to relocate this "invented" respondent, s/he could not be identified.

CHAPTER IV

TV WATCHING IN TV AND NON-TV VILLAGES

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter we will start with an analysis of the survey data. In the sections that follow we attempt to determine in as much detail as possible the profile of the spectators of the general TV programs and their viewing habits.

It is not only interesting but important to take a closer look at the TV spectators in general. In January as well as in April we asked respondents whether they watched TV, as a first screening device between TPT spectators and non-spectators. For those who said that they did not watch TV the questionnaire ended immediately. The TV watchers were asked additional questions to determine their viewing pattern (kinds of programs they watch and the regularity of TV viewing), and to find out whether they watched TPT programs, or to be more precise, whether they made a distinction between the general TV programs, broadcast by the National Radio and Television Organization, RTI, and the specific TPT programs, produced and broadcast by the OSTV department of the Ministry of Primary and Television Education.

Besides, we also asked people in non-TV villages whether they knew about TV and whether they had seen it. This was to determine the extent of TV exposure despite the fact that the non-TV villagers neither have access to a TV receiver in the local school house nor in a private home.

In the following sections we will first give a general overview of the viewing pattern and audience size, and in the second place we will consider the socio-economic composition of the general TV audience.

4.2. TV watching in TV villages

4.2.1. Number of TV spectators

In January the screening question was formulated very broadly: "Do you watch TV programs?" (Q. 41). In contrast, in April, the same question (Q. 27) was limited to the period in between the two surveys. Therefore, the January and April questions measured different things which are, however, comparable, as we will see.

In Table 1, the absolute and relative frequencies of the answers to both questions are given. In January 62 percent of the respondents in TV

TABLE 4-1

"Do You Watch Television?" (January) and "Have You Watched Television Since January ?" (April)

Answer	January		April	
	N	%	N	%
No	181	37.8	199	52.0
Yes	297	62.0	183	47.8
No answer	1	0.2	1	0.3
Total	479	100.0	383	100.0

villages said they watch TV, in April this was only 48 percent, the difference probably reflecting the differently worded questions. This is not unexpected. The interviewers were instructed to fill half of their quotas with TV spectators (see Sections 2.3.3. and 2.5.6.). In this they succeeded and therefore the data should not be interpreted in the sense that half of all adults in TV villages do or do not watch TV.

4.2.2. Reasons for not watching

Those who said that they did not watch TV were asked, "Why not?" In both surveys, three-fourths of the non-spectators replied that they did not have time or were too "tired"[1]. This reason becomes important when we realize that it takes some effort of the people to go to the local schoolhouse for watching the TV. Of those who watch TV, 83.2 percent in January and 84.7 percent in April reported that they watch the TV programs in the local school. Four to five percent watch at home, and this is probably only in the villages with electricity, or in the case of a rich respondent who can afford a private electric generator. Eight percent watch elsewhere, probably when they are in town, and three to four percent gives no answer. Other reasons for not watching are far less important: In January "difficult access" is mentioned 12 times (7.2%), while "illness" in April counts as 4.5 percent of the reasons (9 cases). Some people mention that the time of the telecasts is not good (probably referring to TPT), others see the school as an inappropriate place for watching TV, or cite difficulties with the teachers as the reason why they do not come (anymore).

Here we observe a major difference between the "subjective" declarations and the "objective" factors which limit the attractiveness of TPT as found in previous research reports: The inappropriateness of the school as an outside and also physically peripheral institution[2] in the village and the non-integration of the teacher-animator. There need not be a contradiction between the "subjective" and the "objective" reasons. We are convinced that many responses, made in the interviewer-respondent situation, are so formulated as not to offend the interviewer. Therefore, the reasons for not watching TV remain very vague and inconclusive.

4.2.3. Regularity

To know the regularity of TV watching we asked whether the TV spectators watched "very often", "from time to time" or "almost never". Table 2 provides the distribution of the responses in January and April.

TABLE 4-2

Frequency of TV watching in January and April

Frequency	January		April	
	N	%	N	%
Very often	85	28.5	36	20.1
From time to time	198	66.4	126	70.4
Almost never	15	5.0	17	9.5
Total	298	100.0	183	100.0

In general we observe a similar pattern for the two surveys. However, in April the "very often" category has somewhat decreased while the other two categories have increased. Could it be that the April answers are more realistic because they are only referring to the limited time period of three months since January, while the January question left the recall period indefinite? In any case the figures suggest that the majority of those who watch TV do this more or less regularly. Twenty-five percent do it certainly more than once a week, while about 70 percent do it once or twice a month. This high percentage of the spectators in the two categories: regularly and more than once a week gains in significance when a study among 300 people in 28 villages[3] finds that 76 percent of the TV spectators report that they watch at least once a week. Later in Section 5.3. we will see that a large majority of the "very often" spectators are also TPT spectators.

4.2.4. Kind of TV programs watched and preferred

The TV spectators were also asked what kind of programs they watched. Their answers were classified by the interviewers into 17 categories (Q. 45, January). When coding these answers for computer analysis the various program categories were collapsed into three larger groups: "only TPT", "TPT and other RTI (general television) programs" and "only RTI programs"[4]. Table 3 gives the frequency distribution of the pre- and post-survey answers.

TABLE 4-3

"What Kind Of TV Programs Do You Watch?"

	January		April	
	N	%	N	%
Only TPT	68	22.8	50	27.3
TPT and RTI	130	43.6	100	54.6
Only RTI	88	29.5	26	14.2
Don't know	8	2.7	2	1.1
No Answer	4	1.3	5	2.7
Total	298	100.00	183	100.0

It is most remarkable in this Table that in January a total of 66.2 percent of the TV spectators and in April even 81.9 percent declared that they watched, among other things, TPT. But there is also a considerable number of people (88 in January and 26 in April) who said that they only watched the general RTI program.

The large numbers of TPT viewers is explained by the fact that, although there is evidence that the TV schools are opened on other days of the week as well (see also Section 4.2.5.), usually they are (supposedly)

always opened for the TPT broadcasts on Wednesdays and Fridays. Taking into account that only about one-fourth of the TV viewers watch "TPT only" the figures indicate that the interest for the RTI programs is also high, slightly higher in January (73 percent) than in April (69 percent).

Do these figures suggest that the interest for TPT has increased in the period January-April in comparison with the period before January 1977? This would be overstating the case, but it is clear from the responses to the question of what kind of other TV programs the spectators preferred (Q. 48, January) that the interest in TPT-type programs is large. Among the 188 spectators providing a clear answer to this question, 32 percent wanted to see TV programs related to village matters, 37 percent preferred programs related to city and village matters, while only 15 percent declared that they preferred city-oriented TV programs. Twelve percent said they like to watch "everything", 2 percent prefer "literacy programs" and 2 percent give "village and literacy programs" as an answer.

These "preferences" do not immediately correspond with the results of previous studies dealing with the desires of the rural population and the TPT animators concerning TPT programming. These desires were found to lie in three interest areas: health, literacy training and agriculture[5]. However, in these previous studies the questions had been formulated differently. There the animators (also answering for the TPT audience itself) were "forced" to indicate their priority choices among 10 subject areas for TPT programs. Our present survey question recorded only the spontaneous answers, which later were reclassified.

There is an additional element which could explain the difference between present and previous results: If villagers are interested in TV

programs concerning village matters, it is very likely that those matters have to do with the actual problems and situations of the village. In the section describing the sample villages (Section 3.2.), it appeared that health is a major problem in the villages. Also, from personal experience we know that agriculture (and the related land shortage) is on everybody's mind. Moreover, on the TPT feedback reports, requests for literacy programs via TPT are very often formulated. Thus, health, agriculture and literacy training could well be in the thoughts of the respondents who wish to see more TV programs related to village matters.

4.2.5. Days TV watched

In order to clarify the issue whether TV villagers only watch on the official TPT evenings or whether the school is opened more than two nights a week, we asked the TV spectators on what days or occasions they watched TV. Table 4 indicates that at least 66 percent of the TV audience (in April 82 percent) watch on the evenings that TPT programs are broadcast, but also on other evenings. However, the fact that only one-third to two-fifths of the TV audience say that they watch TV on Wednesdays or Fridays alone - the TPT evenings - indicates also that the TV schools are opened other days of the week. It is impossible to ascertain whether this is the regular procedure in all TV villages, or that it depends on the desire of the school director to watch on certain evenings or to watch certain events, such as a football match. It is certain, however, that the TV receivers in the schools are used more frequently than was originally supposed when starting the TPT programs.

TABLE 4-4

What Days Of The Week Do You Watch TV?"

	January		April	
	N	%	N	%
Wednesday and Friday	90	31.4	72	43.9
Other evenings	44	15.3	12	7.3
Depending on the event	39	13.6	12	7.3
Wednesday, Friday and other evenings	89	31.0	56	34.1
TPT and events	11	3.8	6	3.7
All evenings	14	4.9	6	3.7
Total	287*	100.0	164*	100.0

* The "do not know" answers and the non-responses (11 in January and 19 in April) are not included in this table.

4.2.6. TV as instruction and entertainment

We saw that a large number of TV spectators wish to see village matters on TV. This is based on the desire to see themselves and their daily situations represented as well as to learn about important village problems such as agricultural production, health, rural exodus[6]. This attitude is somewhat confirmed by the answers on the question asking what purpose TV is serving. We note that more than half of the TV spectators say that TV serves for instruction (Q. 47, January). Twenty-one percent say that TV's objective is "instruction and entertainment", while 10 percent see only "entertainment" as its goal. Four percent see the main purpose of

of TV as the "instruction of children". This response is not surprising considering that TV was first introduced in the primary schools for teaching children.

Thus, about half the TV audience wants to "get something out" of TV. They regard -- and this is supported by the findings in the Grant/Seya study (1976) -- TV as a means to widen their horizon, a means by which they can receive "instructions" about how to improve their living situation. Of course, we are well-aware of the fact that the respondents may have presented a picture which corresponds well with the intentions of the Government and presumably with the objectives of the researchers, as far as TV and TPT is concerned. But even allowing for this possible bias, it seems to us that a large part of the TV spectators attempt to "learn" something from watching TV, and thus are susceptible to its messages. We will see later that among those who regard "instruction" as the major purpose of TV, the majority say they watch TPT.

Having seen their viewing habits we now turn to the socio-economic composition of spectators. In the first place we want to examine whether certain social categories, such as men or educated people watch relatively more or less than women and illiterate people. Secondly, we want to establish the socio-economic background of the majority of spectators.

4.3. TV audience characteristics

4.3.1. Introduction

Previous studies of TPT usually have dealt with the composition

of the TPT audience as such. Only one recent study[7] has examined in some detail the social make-up of rural TV watchers. Our survey tried to investigate both: We wanted to have a description of the general TV audience in TV villages in terms of their sex, age, ethnic affiliation, profession, income, social status, and level of schooling, as well as the description of the TPT audiences. As mentioned earlier (see Section 1.2.3.1.) there were several hypotheses about the distribution of these variables, especially among the TPT watchers. These will be dealt with successively in the following paragraphs.

The reader should bear one thing in mind when studying the findings and conclusions: It is virtually impossible to make conclusive statements about the sex and age distribution of the TV audience because these same variables were used as criteria for choosing the sample (see Section 2.3.). We consciously "over-sampled" men. Also, the proportions of the different age groups were not proportional to the general population, the 26-45 age group having 47 percent of the sampled respondents, while they represent only about 27 percent of the total population[8]. However, significant statements can be made about whether richer people watch more TV than poorer ones; whether there are relatively more TV watchers among "authorities" than among "ordinary citizens" whether the ethnic affiliation makes a difference in TV watching; and whether profession, religion and level of education are related to TV watching.

4.3.2. TV watching in January and April

In the following presentation of findings[9] we will consider the TV audience characteristics in January as well as in April. (The TPT audience composition will be dealth with in Section 5.2.) One recalls (see Sections 2.4.3. and 4.1.) that the question about TV watching in the pre-

and the post-questionnaires were different. In January the question referred to the period prior to January, and probably included TV watching from TV's beginning in the village. In April the question was asked specifically for the period between the two surveys. Thus the two questions measured different realities, and therefore the distribution of audience characteristics may vary also.

Because of the different measures it is interesting to start this description by examining whether those who declared watching TV in January also declared watching in April. This issue can only be addressed by comparing the responses of those who were present during both surveys, and who gave an answer to both questions (382 persons). Out of the 242 January spectators only 58 percent (141) also watched TV in the period between the two surveys. More than 40 percent (101) did not, and this indicates that a considerable portion of the January TV audience probably did not watch TV in the period shortly before the post-questionnaire. The question was, however, too broadly formulated to make this distinction. In other words, if we consider that watching or not watching TV in a period of three months is a good indication whether someone watches TV at all, the data suggest that about 40 percent of the January spectators had abandoned TV watching. But it is also true that among the April spectators there are 42 respondents (or 23 percent) who in January had not said they watched TV. This means that, although there are villagers who do not watch anymore, there are others who took the initiative to start watching TV. This could be another indication that there is a large fluctuation among TV spectators, and especially among TPT participants (see Sections 4.2.3. and 5.3. for other data).

4.3.3. Sex

The most common hypothesis about the TPT audience composition is

that men watch in greater number than women. Taking into account that the sex variable was a sample criterion, this hypothesis probably holds also for the TV audiences (see Table 5). The differences between men and women - 15 percentage points in January and 18 percentage points in April - are in both cases statistically significant[10].

TABLE 4-5

Distribution of TV and non-TV spectators in January and April, according to sex

	January				April			
	Men		Women		Men		Women	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Does not watch TV	104	32.7	77	48.1	117	46.1	82	64.1
Watches TV	214	72.1	83	51.9	137	53.9	46	35.9
Total	318	100.0	160	100.0	254	100.0	128	100.0
	(Chi-square = 10.1)				(Chi-square = 10.3)			

4.3.4. Age

Previous studies have shown and suggested that the villagers in the younger age groups are relatively over-represented in the TPT audience. We assumed that this was also the case for the general TV audiences. Although age was one of the sample criteria, Table 6 seems to confirm this hypothesis. There are relatively more TV viewers among the villagers between 15 and 45 years old than among those older than 45 years (the differences between the age groups being significant). The January data would suggest that in the

TABLE 6

Distribution of TV spectators and non-spectators in January and April according to age

	January						April					
	15-25 years		26-45 years		46 and more years		15-25 years		26-45 years		46 and more years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Does not watch TV	50	33.1	77	35.3	54	50.0	57	52.3	82	46.1	60	62.5
Watches TV	101	66 9	141	64.7	54	50.0	52	47.7	94	53.4	36	37.5
Total	151	100.0	218	100.0	108	100.0	109	100.0	176	100.0	96	100.0

Chi-square = 8.8, df = 2

Chi-square = 6.3, df = 2

middle age group there are relatively more TV spectators than in the other two age groups. The April data, however, contradict this. Therefore it is likely that the major difference in TV watching lies between the two younger age groups on the one hand and the older people on the other as suggested by Benveniste (1976).

4.3.5. Ethnic affiliation

We wanted to know whether TV watching varies from one ethnic group to another. Data from the TPT feedback system had indicated that the people in the North (Senoufo, Mandé) watch less TPT programs than the people in the Center and the South of the country. Significant differences between the number of TV spectators in the various ethnic groups were found in January (Chi-square = 10.05, df = 7). But when rank-ordering the six main ethnic groups surveyed on the proportion of their TV spectators we obtain Table 7 which shows that although two Center ethnic groups occupy the top positions, the Mandé rank third.

The relatively high ranking of the Mandé, mainly Dioula, could be partially explained by the fact that many of them do not live in their region of origin. They live spread over the country as small craftsmen and merchants but also as farmers. Although they usually do not actively participate in the matters of their (host) village, it has been observed (e.g., Benveniste, 1976) that they form a sizeable portion of the TPT spectators, and thus of the TV audience. For April the picture is "disturbed". The differences between the various ethnic groups are not significant anymore, and the rank-ordering has changed. This is certainly due to the fact that the TV question in April measured something else than the January TV question. Assuming that the April question reflects the present reality better it means that the interest for TV watching has decreased among the Akan and the Dan, for example,

and/or increased among the Lagoon people and the Mandé.

TABLE 4-7

Relative frequency of TV spectators in 6 ethnic groups

	January		April	
Dan (Gouro)	72%	1.	46%	3.
Akan (Agni, Baoule)	67%	2.	44%	5.
Mandé (Dioula)	65%	3.	55%	2.
Lagoon (Adioukrou)	61%	4.	57%	1.
Bété	58%	5.	45%	4.
Sénoufo	55%	6.	43%	6.

4.3.6. Religion and social status

The religion variable proved not to be significantly related to TV watching despite the fact that previous studies had hypothesized that TPT spectators were more to be found among Christians and Animists than among Moslems.

About a difference in TV watching between "authorities" and "ordinary citizens" no hypotheses had been formulated. The data do not show a significant difference between the two groups. And this corresponds to the results of the media survey of 1976 held among 300 rural people[11].

4.3.7. Membership in voluntary associations

We did not find significant differences in TV watching either among the members and non-members of voluntary associations such as cultural groups, sports clubs and cooperatives. It might have been assumed that those who are active in this domain would be more active TV spectators than those who do not join voluntary associations of whatever kind, but the survey results do not bear this out.

4.3.8. Profession

In surveys among the rural population the variable "profession" coincides to a large extent with the "sex" variable. Usually up to 90 percent of the males are listed as planter/cultivator and female respondents are housewives (see Section 3.3.5.). Therefore, if we found a sex difference in watching TV we expect to find a difference as well among the various professions. This is indeed the case in January and in April. Both times the differences are statistically significant (Chi-square = 13.5, df = 3 resp. Chi-square 6.9, df = 3), and they show that within the planter/cultivator category there are relatively more TV watchers than in the categories of "housewife" and "other professions" (see Table 8). The differences between planters and cultivators are not significant.

TABLE 4-8

Distribution of TV spectators and non-spectators in January and April according to profession

	Planter		Cultivator		Housewife		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
January								
Does not watch TV	70	30.8	24	37.5	58	51.3	26	38.8
Watches TV	157	69.2	40	62.4	55	48.7	41	61.2
Total	227	100.0	64	100.0	113	100.0	67	100.0
April								
Does not watch TV	89	49.2	24	43.6	57	63.3	27	55.1
Watches TV	92	50.8	31	56.4	33	36.7	22	44.9
Total	181	100.0	55	100.0	90	100.0	49	100.0

4.3.9. Income

It was assumed that the amount of income a person had would also affect his/her TV watching. This hypothesis was confirmed for the January sample. Table 9 shows a positive relationship between the level of income and TV watching. The differences between the four income categories are statistically significant, and it follows that there is a tendency for the higher income groups to watch more TV than the lower income groups. However,

TABLE 4-9

Distribution of January TV spectators and non-spectators according to income

	Without income		0-50,000 CFA Francs		51,000-200,000		201,000 and more	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Does not watch TV	57	44.2	43	41.3	50	36.5	19	22.9
Watches TV	72	15.9	61	58.7	87	63.5	64	77.1
Total	129	100.0	104	100.0	137	100.0	83	100.0

Chi-square = 10.7 df = 3

this picture is not repeated exactly, when using the same January income measure[12] on the April viewer figures; the differences between the income categories are not significant, though there seems to be a similar pattern as in January. This pattern is reproduced, and this time with significant differences (Chi-square = 8.8, df = 3), when examining the relationship with April viewer figures and the April income measure.

4.3.10. Education

We feel that the most important independent variable which could explain to a certain extent the fact of TV watching or not, is the level of instruction or schooling. It has been observed among the TPT audience that people with some kind of education are over-represented in comparison with the educational distribution of the total potential population. This has been found for the urban audience[13] as well as for the rural TPT audience[14]. Therefore, it was very likely that also among the TV spectators, we would find relatively more people with some kind of education than people with no education at all. As can be seen in Table 10, in January there was a

TABLE 4-10

Distribution of January TV spectators and non-spectators according to educational level

	Illiterate		Understands and speaks French		With formal education	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Does not watch TV	144	44.3	18	26.5	19	22.4
Watches TV	181	55.7	50	73.5	66	77.6
Total	325	100.0	68	100.0	85	100.0

large difference between the proportion of illiterates who watched TV on the one hand and the TV watchers who speak and understand French or with some formal education on the other hand[15]. This difference was significant. Although a similar tendency for the April data can be observed, the differences between the three education categories are much smaller and not significant. Therefore, the data, in total, do not conclusively prove or disprove the

original hypothesis. However, chances are great that there exists a positive relationship between education and TV watching which means that the more education one has the more TV one watches. And this relationship is explained by the desire of and the necessity for more educated people, especially those who live in sometimes rather isolated villages, to maintain contact with the outside world, to enlarge their horizon, to be open to new experiences and information. Through their education these people have come into contact with the "modern" world, and have "learned" to accept part of its beliefs, values as well as material "advantages". Radio listening, TV watching and the reading of printed materials can all sustain and expand these "acquisitions"[16]. Another practical factor is that more educated people are more likely to understand French and find a translator less of a barrier to grasping the message of the TV programs. There is, finally, the possibility that the more educated seek more information and solutions to village problems because they perceive themselves as more capable of creating solutions.

4.3.11. Two audience profiles

In the foregoing sections we have examined the relationship between TV watching and a number of independent socio-economic variables. Thus, we have put together a picture of the TV audience: there are probably more male than female spectators; the younger age groups watch more heavily, so do some ethnic groups. Planters and cultivators form a large part of the TV audience. The more income one has increases the chances that one watches TV, and, lastly, those with education are more likely to be TV watchers than those without.

We were interested to see whether the original relationships between TV watching and some of the independent variables would hold, change or disappear when controlling for a second independent variable. Several cross-tabulations were generated in with sex, age, education and income as the

independent and control variables and with TV watching as the independent variable. No clear interaction patterns were identified. However, whatever the interaction among the various independent variables, a picture of the characteristics of the general TV audience emerges. And to a large extent this picture confirms previous research results concerning TPT spectators. We could look at this picture from two different angles. First, and this has been done in the previous sections, we can examine whether and to what extent there are a disproportionate number of TV spectators in the various social groups: men, women, rich, poor, educated people and illiterates, old and young persons, etc. when compared with the spectator-non-spectator distribution in the total sample. Secondly, we can determine what the social characteristics are of the "majority" of the TV spectators. It may very well be that seen from the two angles the picture shows variations. For example, it could be that the majority of the spectators are planters (which would be a reflection of the distribution of the "profession" variable in the sample), but at the same time "cattle breeders" watch relatively more TV than "planters". This would indicate that there is an aspect of cattle breeders as distinct from planters which affects TV watching.

Looking at the audience composition picture from the first angle of relative numbers we can characterize it as follows: men are likely to watch relatively more than women, so do the younger people under 45 years old compared with older people. Some ethnic groups are disproportionally present among the TV spectators. There are more planters and cultivators than expected, and this is also the case for the higher income categories. Perhaps the most significant characteristic of the TV audience is that those with some educational background are more numerous than expected on the basis of the total number of respondents with some education. Because such

relative "over-representation" almost automatically produces a relative "under-representation" of the other categories: women, older people, housewives and other professions (including jobless persons), lower income people and illiterates, the picture suggests -- and this is confirmed by other research findings -- that the TV is not completely a community affair. It touches a disproportionate number of people who otherwise (through socio-economic status and position) are (or have been) already in contact with the "modern" world. It seems that for them the TV serves the function of sustaining this contact. This does not mean that the TV reaches only these already "privileged" groups.

When looking at the audience composition picture from the angle of the "majority of spectators" we find the following:

- Seventy-two percent are men (28 percent are women);
- Forty-eight percent are between the age of 26 and 45 years old (33 percent between 15 and 25, and 18 percent are older than 45 years);
- Fifty-five percent are planters (17 percent housewives, 14 percent cultivators, and 13 percent have other professions or are jobless);
- Thirty-one percent have an income between 51,000 and 200,000 CFA Francs (25 percent are without income, 23 percent have 201,000 or more, and 22 percent have between 0 and 50,000 CFA Francs);
- Eighty-four percent are ordinary citizens (15 percent are authorities and 1 percent are field agents or the like);
- Sixty-one percent are illiterate (22 percent have some

education and 19 percent understand and speak French).

And this would make the "typical" TV spectator in our sample a man of about 35 years who is planter, who has a "moderate" income of about 125,000 CFA Francs per year, who does not have an official position in the village structure, who has not gone to school and who does not understand and speak French. This is in contrast with the first "relative" picture we sketched of a man, less than 45 years old who is planter or cultivator, who falls into the higher income brackets and has had some formal education. But here it should be borne in mind that the "majority" profile reflects the distribution of socio-economic variables within the sample. Because this distribution was not the result of a random sampling procedure, but of a stratified-quota sample, the "majority" profile is not a correct representation of reality. Both pictures should be considered together. But they give an indication of what kind of audience the TV is catering to in the villages in the Ivory Coast.

Before analyzing a smaller portion of the general TV audience which reports watching TPT - the major focus of this study - we will present some data on the "odd" phenomenon of TV watching in villages without a TV school.

4.4. TV watching in non-TV villages

4.4.1. Viewing pattern

Six villages without a TV school were included in the sample. As explained elsewhere (see Section 2.4.2.3.) in January a special (short) questionnaire was administered to the 20 respondents in each non-TV village, which included also some questions about TV watching in general. The latter questions were asked to obtain some ideas to what extent TV affects (or has

affected already) the rural population which, supposedly, does not have immediate access to a TV receiver[17].

The first question about TV watching in general asked whether the respondents had ever heard about TV (Q. A1). Out of a total of 122 non-TV villagers more than 77 percent declared that they knew about TV. Twenty-two percent answered NO, and one person did not give a response. As we would expect on the basis of previous studies and on the basis of the general literature dealing with "mass media and social change" we observe that the respondents who know about TV are disproportionally found among the younger (age 15 - 25 years), Christian men with at least some money income, and who understand and speak French but who are also very likely to have some formal education[18]. The most significant variable is, however, the village in which they live. For example, in Paabénéfla, a village which in January was in the active process of constructing a school which was to be equipped with TV receivers in March, all the respondents knew about TV, while in a remote village such as Timbo only 62 percent knew about it. Therefore, it seems very likely that the relative isolation of the village plays an important role in the extent to which its inhabitants are exposed to the idea of TV if not the TV itself.

Those who declared that they knew about TV were asked whether they ever watched TV (Q. A2). The large majority of them (77 respondents) said YES, while only 17 respondents declared that they had not. These responses mean that considerably more than half of the non-TV sample (63 percent) had watched TV. And this is a first indication that the TV could have some effects even in relatively isolated areas where there is no immediate access to TV.

Before examining in some more detail the characteristics of the TV audience in non-TV villages, we will first report on the viewing pattern: frequency, location of TV watching, kind of TV programs watched. Naturally, this pattern can only be established for the 77 persons who reported watching TV and who responded to the questions that followed.

Seventy-one persons responded to the question about the frequency with which they watched TV (Q. A3). As expected only a small group of six people watched "from time to time" and 16 percent watched "almost never". Regular watching will be very difficult when one does not have immediate access to a TV receiver, and one has to wait for the occasion to travel to a larger town or one has to make a very special effort, for example, going to a nearby village. That this is indeed the case is confirmed in the distribution of answers on the question about where the spectators watched TV (Q. A4). In Table 11 we see that three-fourths of the TV spectators see TV programs outside their village. And this is as expected.

TABLE 4-11

"Where Do You Watch TV?"

	N	%
In the neighboring village	13	17.8
In town	41	56.2
In the village	18	24.7
Elsewhere	1	1.4
Total	73	100.0

It is still surprising to find that 25 percent watch (or have watched) in their own village, which -- almost by definition -- does not have electricity. When checking this answer we found that watching in their own village

was the case in three out of the six non-TV villages. One of these villages was Paabénéfla, which, as we saw already, was in the process of having a TV school. We know that in this village at least one private home was equipped with a TV set hooked to a portable electric generator, and it is likely that villagers, among whom some of the respondents, watch TV here. It is also possible that the other two non-TV villages with TV spectators who watch in their own village, had one or two individually owned TV sets, although we do not have firm evidence of this.

We wanted to know whether the fact that TV spectators have access to a TV receiver in their own village would influence the frequency of TV watching. Our data do not suggest that there is a relationship between "often" watching and TV watching in the village. Out of the six "often" TV spectators, three watch in the neighboring village (with a TV school), two watch in the town, and only one watches locally, and we do not know whether he watches at home or elsewhere.

When asked about the day or days they watch TV (Q. A5) 18 spectators do not or cannot give an answer, and four declare that they do not know. The answers of the remaining 55 are very diverse, as can be seen in Table 12. There does not seem to be a stable pattern. This is not surprising given the fact that TV watching in non-TV villages is not a regular event such as in TV villages. People watch on random occasions when they happen to be near a TV set.

If on the basis of these responses we would attempt to find out what percentage watch (or has watched) the TPT programs, the figures would indicate that a maximum of 30.5 percent of the TV spectators are exposed to these programs. And this is a much lower percentage than for the TPT spectators in the TV villages. This is confirmed by the distribution of answers

TABLE 4-12

"On What Days Do You Watch TV?"

	N	%
Wednesday and Friday	2	3.4
Other evenings	12	20.3
With special occasions	11	18.6
Wednesday, Friday and other nights	10	16.9
All nights	6	10.2
Occasionally	14	23.7
Total	55	100.0

to the question what kind of TV programs the TV spectators follow (Q. A6). Excluding the four non-responses almost everybody (97 percent) reports that they watch the general RTI programs or the RTI and TPT programs together. Only two people say that they watch (or have watched) TPT programs alone. When adding the "TPT only" category to the "RTI and TPT" categories we obtain a percentage of 42 percent who see or have seen one or more TPT programs. But because of the irregular town visits and the in-frequent exposure to TV the chances of watching an RTI program are many times greater than seeing a TPT broadcast.

It is interesting that also in non-TV villages there is a preference among the TV spectators to see TV programs dealing with village matters (Q. A7). Thirty-six percent delcare that they like seeing such programs. Only 10 percent would prefer programs with a "city" content, while 54 percent want to see both types of telecasts. Thus, almost everybody (90 percent) would be very satisfied if they could watch TV programs related to village problems and situations. And in this respect the non-TV villagers are not different from the TV villagers. This is also true for the function they attribute

to TV. The question about TV's purpose (Q. A8) was asked to both spectators and non-spectators (94 respondents). The majority of them, 62 percent, said that TV was for "general instruction". Eighteen percent saw it for "instruction and entertainment", while 5 percent declared that the TV served primarily an entertainment function. Only one person related TV to the "instruction of children". And 13 respondents did not give an answer. These answers clearly indicate also that for many of the non-TV villagers the TV serves (or could serve) as an "eye-opener". It provides images from the outside world and is therefore an information channel about their world. The absence of a TV receiver (or the presence of only one or two privately owned TV sets) make TV in these non-TV villages a far less important information medium than, for instance, radio[19].

In the following section we will examine who these and other TV watching villagers (in non-TV villages) are.

4.4.2. Audience profile

As we did for the audience in the TV villages we can look at the TV spectators in non-TV villages in two ways: First, we can ask who are the majority[20], and secondly which socio-economic groups are over- or under-represented among the TV audience.

Answering the first question gives the following audience profile:

- Seventy-five percent are men (25 percent are women);
- Fifty-three percent are between 36 and 45 years old (39 percent are between 15 and 25 years and only 8 percent are above 45 years);
- Fifty-two percent are Moslem (25 percent are Animist, 18 percent are Christian and 5 percent are without religion);

- Eighty-seven percent are "ordinary citizens" (13 percent are "authorities");
- Eighty-six percent do not belong to a cultural group or sports club (14 percent do);
- Fifty-three point five do not belong to a youth group or cooperative (46.5 percent do);
- Fifty-one percent are planters (27 percent are cultivators, 17 percent are housewives, 5 percent have other professions or are jobless);
- Forty-one percent are in the 51,000 - 200,000 CFA Francs income bracket (22 percent have more than 200,000, 21 percent are in the 0 - 50,000 category and 16 percent are "without income");
- Sixty-nine percent are illiterate (25 percent have some education, 6 percent declares to understand and speak some French).

When looking at the proportion of viewers and non-viewers[21] we, again, obtain a similar pattern as for the TV village spectators: there are relatively more men than women who watch TV (Chi-square = 3.3, df - 1, $p \geq .07$[22]); while especially the older age group has relatively few. The Christians watch relatively more than others, so do the Animists but to a lesser extent (Chi-square = 11.5, df = 3). TV watching authorities and ordinary citizens reflect the distribution of these two social categories in the total sample, as do the members of any voluntary associations, and also the members of the various professional categories. At least, we do not observe statistically significant differences between the number of

TV spectators in all these groups. However, those who have an income between zero and 50,000 CFA Francs watch more TV than others as well as the people (only 24) who have some education or understand and speak French. These latter people all report that they watch TV.

The picture that emerges shows that there are a number of socio-economic characteristics which are related to TV watching in a non-TV village. Because TV watching is closely related to travelling to neighboring villages or to urban center towns it would mean that these characteristics are positively associated with physical mobility. As expected, it is the educated young men, more in the South and the Center (Christian) than in the North who are more prone to TV watching than the other social groups. The explanation for this follows the same reasoning as for the TV audience profile in the TV villages: those who have been or are in contact with the "modern" world are also morely likely to be exposed to the TV messages thus sustaining and reinforcing this contact.

4.5. Conclusion

The foregoing sections have provided us with a general idea of the ways in which people in TV and non-TV villages watch televison, and about some socio-economic characteristics of the general TV audience in both.

With respect to the audience composition we have seen that there is a tendency for a larger number of men to watch than would be expected on the basis of their numbers in the sample, and that this is also the case for people (mostly men) with higher incomes, people who have had some education and younger people. A considerable number of respondents fall into all four categories: male, young, richer and educated, thus indicating

an interaction among these variables in relation to TV watching. These tendencies correspond to a large degree to previous research dealing with TPT spectators as well as general TV spectators.

As far as the viewing pattern is concerned, we found that this is rather unpredictable in non-TV villages due to the fact that non-TV villagers usually have access only to TV during a visit to an urban center.

The TV watching TV villagers do this with some regularity, but probably not to the extent that there is a large group of spectators which fills the classroom of the local school each time the TV receiver is switched on. It has been noted that a considerable number of the TV spectators are likely to be more interested in the general TV programs than in the TPT programs. This is also confirmed by the days the spectators watch. It also appears likely that a number of TV schools open their doors more often than on the two TPT evenings. This officially unauthorized but practically admitted policy has undoubtedly an effect on the lifetime of the TV batteries, and thus on the costs of the TPT project[23].

The tendencies observed will recur among the spectators of the TPT programs because they form a sizeable portion of the TV audience. How they know about TPT, what their viewing habits are, and what their socio-economic characteristics are will be the subject of the following chapter.

REFERENCES

1. The French word "fatigue" means more than only physical "tiredness"; it also includes real "illness", "boredom", "distinterest", etc.
2. Most primary schools are built on the outskirts of the village indicating a continuing cultural isolation of this institution.
3. Seya and Yao, 1977.
4. In a forthcoming study the responses of this question (Q. 45) will be subjected to a more detailed analysis.
5. Kaye and Lenglet, 1975.
6. See Grant and Seya, 1976, Section II.2.4.
7. Seya and Yao, 1977.
8. Population figures of 1973. Source: Ivory Coast Republic, 1976.
9. In the tables and discussion that follow we have consciously omitted the "non-responses" which, as far as TV audience characteristics are concerned, do not amount to more than 10 percent of the respondents. We assume these are randomly distributed over the various socio-economic variables but do not analyze their responses as such.
10. When a difference between, for example, the numbers of male and female TV spectators is statistically significant, it means that there is a large probability (usually 95 percent) that this difference is not due to chance. The Chi-square statistic allows us to gauge how probable it is that differences between groups occur by chance. Levels of significance are given in numbers between zero and 1. Generally, social researchers use levels of significance of .05.
11. Seya and Yao, 1977.

12. See Section 3.3.7. for a discussion of the January and April income measures.
13. Bourgault, 1975.
14. See Fritz, 1976, and Lenglet, 1976.
15. The category of "understand and speak French" is not an exclusive category, because its individuals are also illiterate. What distinguishes them from the "illiterates" is that they are able to converse in (basic) French, which indicates that they have had more contact with the colonial or "modern" world, although they have not followed any formal education. Some of the respondents in this category have served in the French or Ivorian Army, where they have acquired some knowledge of the French language.
16. For similar findings, see Seya and Yao, 1977.
17. In April no questions about TV viewing were asked to the non-TV villagers.
18. The differences were statistically significant.
19. See Seya and Yao, 1977.
20. As explained before, the "majority" profile is an immediate function of the sample distribution based on non-random sample selection. Therefore not too much importance should be attached to it.
21. In the crosstabulations which produced these results, we excluded the non-respondents who are never more than 7 percent of the total number of respondents (122).
22. And not the usual $p > 0.5$.
23. See also Klees, 1977, and Eicher and Orivel, 1977.

CHAPTER V

TPT WATCHING IN TV VILLAGES

5.1. Introduction

During the pre-survey we asked the respondents the immediate question, "Do you watch the TPT programs?", in order to obtain the total number of TPT spectators among the individual samples. In April this question was not repeated. In January we had observed that TV viewers were not able to distinguish well between the general TV programs and the particular TPT programs (see Section 2.4.3.). Therefore in the second questionnaire we adopted a composite measure for estimating the total TPT audience among the individual respondents. The composite measure was made up of people who reported to watch TV in the local school, who watched on the evenings of the TPT broadcasts and who, according to their answers on the question, "What kind of broadcasts do you watch?", seemed to watch TPT programs.

Moreover, the questions on TPT in the pre-survey dealt with a relatively long period which could go back until the original start of the TPT sessions, while the TPT questions in the post-survey dealth only with the period between January and April 1977 (see Section 4.2.1.). Therefore, we are not able to make immediate comparisons between the January and April results.

This chapter has three main sections. Section 5.2. deals with the socio-economic characteristics of the TPT audience by presenting the data of January and April. The results indicate that the TPT audience does not differ too much from the total TV audience. This is more or less expected. The second Section (5.3.) is mainly based on the January results

because particularly in the pre-survey we were interested in the following questions:

- What are the viewing habits of the TPT audience?
- What does the TPT audience think about the information it receives about the TPT sessions?
- How do the TPT spectators perceive the animator sessions themselves?
- What is their opinion about the function of TV?

One preliminary remark before presenting the data: The reader should not be surprised to encounter, in the following pages, certain variations in the total number of TPT spectators, which vary from 194, 192, 191 to 188 for the January data and from 141 to 137 for the April data, depending on which question is discussed. The variation occurs because for each question there is a certain number of non-responses which during the analysis must either be forgotten or taken into account. Summarizing, the total number of TPT spectators is 194 in January and 145 in April. Differing figures are reported when there are missing observations.

5.2. TPT audience characteristics

5.2.1. Sex

We will repeat the conclusion of a previous section (4.3.3.): Among the TPT audience there is a clear disequilibrium in favor of men. Two-thirds of the TPT spectators are men, one-third are women. And this reflects the male-female distribution of the original sample. We are unable to make any further statement about this variable because, as indicated earlier, the variables of sex, age and social status were sampling criteria.

This means that they have affected the structure of the sample which, in its turn, affects the research data.

5.2.2. Age

We remain careful with respect to "age" data. The differences between the various age groups among the TPT audience do not appear to be statistically significant, and this is the fact for both the pre- and the post-survey. Results from the Seya and Yao (1977) report confirms our finding that the age variable does not seem to have a determining effect on the composition of the TPT audience.

5.2.3. Ethnic affiliation

Table 1 shows clearly that there is a slight over-representation of the Akan and the Dan ethnic groups among the TPT audience in comparison to their respective weight in the total of sampled TV villagers, but there is a slight under-representation of the Sénoufo group. When relating this finding to the villages where these ethnic groups belong[1] it means that the villages of the Center, the Center-East and the Center-West regions of the country have a relatively higher rate of TPT watching than the other regions. However, it should be kept in mind that the villages of the forest zone, which covers large parts of the three regions mentioned earlier, represent the largest group of the sample.

It seems difficult to push this analysis any further, the more so because the April results - for the TPT and the TV audience - are statistically not significant and present a different ethnic distribution of the TPT viewers. Because the variable of ethnic affiliation covers economic and cultural realities, the variables of monetary income and level of education could be more "instructive" in analyzing the TPT audience.

TABLE 5-1

Distribution of TV villagers and TPT spectators according to ethnic groups

	TV villagers		TPT spectators (January)	
	N	%	N	%
Lagoon group	57	12	24	12
Akan	93	19	48	25
Séhoufo	110	23	40	21
Mandé	80	17	30	16
Dan	89	18	41	21
Bété	24	5	6	3
Voltaian	26	5	6	3
Total	479	100	194	100

5.2.4. Religion, social status and membership in voluntary associations

Referring to Sections 4.3.6. and 4.3.7., which deal with the religion, social status and membership in voluntary associations of the TV spectators, we affirm that no conclusion can be drawn with respect to these variables. There is no statistical evidence for a significant difference between the various religious groups, between the various social status levels, and between the membership or non-membership in sports clubs, youth associations, cooperatives. etc.

5.2.5. Profession

The reading of Table 2 shows that with respect to their weight within the total sample, the planters, who sell their agricultural products are relatively more numerous than the other professional groups. This is the case in January as well as April. In contrastthe housewives, essentially the women

without income, are under-represented. This is not surprising for we know that they come in smaller numbers to TPT and that the category of people without income is also slightly under-represented among the TPT audience (see following Section 5.2.6.)

We arrive at the same conclusions as given in Section 4.3.8. with respect to the total TV audience. The TPT spectators cannot be distinguished from the whole group of TV spectators: In terms of professions they are not different.

TABLE 5-2

Distribution of TV villagers and TPT spectators according to profession

	TV villagers		TPT spectators			
			January		April	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Planters	227	48	107	56	78	55
Cultivators	68	14	23	12	23	16
Housewives	113	24	31	16	21	15
Other professions	68	14	31	16	19	14
Total	479	100	152	100	141	100

5.2.6. Income

With respect to annual income we notice that there is a postive relationship between income and watching TPT. This appears to be the case in January as well as April (see Table 3). We observe the tendency that people with higher incomes watch TPT relatively more than people in the lower income categories.

TABLE 5-3

Distribution of TPT spectators and non-TPT spectators in January and April, according to annual income

January

	Without income		1 - 50,000 CFA Francs		51, - 200,000 CFA Francs		201,000 CFA Francs and more	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Does not watch TPT	87	67	66	53	79	58	37	45
Watches TPT	42	33	38	37	58	42	46	55
Total	129	100	104	100	137	100	83	100

April

Does not watch TPT	76	74	53	64	64	59	32	48
Watches TPT	27	26	30	36	45	41	35	52
Total	103	100	83	100	109	100	67	100

In Table 4 we observe that those who fall in the highest annual income brackets form one quarter of the TPT audience.

If one would argue that the wealthiest people control a large part of the economic and political power in the village, these results are in contrast with previous research conclusions. For example, Benveniste (1976 : vi) concludes that those who participate in TPT are not the groups who have the power. Thus it seems that even if the wealthiest peasants are not the most active and regular TPT spectators - and irrespective of their motivation for TPT watching - they are at least not absent from the TPT sessions.

TABLE 5-4

Distribution of TV villagers and TPT spectators according to annual income

	TV villagers		TPT spectators			
			January		April	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Without income	129	29	49	23	27	20
1 - 50,000 CFA Francs	104	23	38	21	30	22
51, - 200,000 CFA Francs	137	30	58	32	45	33
201,000 CFA Francs and more	83	18	46	25	35	26
Total	479	100	184	100	137	100

5.2.7. Education

As for annual income we find, in January, a positive relationship between TPT watching and education. The results, depicted in Table 5 show a tendency that people with some formal education will watch more TPT than those without. And this confirms similar research results presented by Lenglet (1976) and Fritz (1976).

However, as has been observed before (Section 4.3.10.) the data of the April survey, although showing a similar tendency, are statistically not significant. This could be due to the fact that in January and April we used two different measures for estimating the total number of TPT spectators (see Section 5.1.).

TABLE 5-5

Distribution of January TPT spectators and non-TPT spectators according to education

	Illiterate		Understand and speak French		With formal education	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Does not watch TPT	214	66	36	53	35	41
Watches TPT	112	34	32	47	50	59
Total	326	100	68	100	85	100

Because different research shows similar tendencies[2] - that people with some education watch more TPT than people without - the conclusion is not unwarranted that education is an important factor in explaining why people watch TPT or why not. At the same time it must be realized that more than the absolute majority of the TPT spectators have not had any schooling.

Thus, from the previous paragraphs it appears that the majority of TPT spectators are men who are predominantly planters, who fall in the lower income brackets and who have not gone to school. At the same time it is also found that people with higher incomes, planters and people with at least some formal schooling are relatively over-represented among the TPT spectators in comparison with what one could expect on the basis of their total number in the TV village sample.

Let us now consider the viewing habits of these TPT spectators.

5.3. TPT watching

5.3.1. The number of TPT spectators among TV spectators

Here it is perhaps necessary to remember that during the sampling we

consciously tried to select at least 50% TV spectators in the TV villages (see Section 2.3.3.). Although this objective was not completely achieved, it meant that the number of TPT spectators in the TV villages is certainly much higher than if they had been randomly sampled. National estimates (Fritz, 1976, and Lenglet and McAnany, 1977) indicate an average number of TPT spectators in each TV village varying between 30 and 50, which is only a small fraction of the total potential TPT population.

Moreover, and this is shown in Table 6, the TPT spectators

TABLE 5-6

Number of TPT spectators among TV spectators in January and April

	January		April	
	N	%	N	%
Number of TV spectators who do not watch TPT or who have not answered the relevant question	106	36	38	24
Number of TV spectators who watch TPT	192	64	145	76
Total number of TV spectators in TV villages	298	100	183	100

form the large majority of the total TV audience for the simple reason that the TV sets in the schools are in principle only switched on for watching the TPT broadcasts. This means that if this rule is followed, one is TPT spectator in the first place and general TV spectator "just by accident".[3] That is why most of the results in the "TV audience characteristics" section (4.3.) are

also valid for the much more restricted TPT audience, as we will see in the following sections.

5.3.2. Knowing about TPT and TPT watching

In answer to Question 49 of the individual January questionnaire: "Do you know that each Wednesday and Friday at 8:15 P.M. the TV in the school presents broadcasts, called TPT, which are followed by discussion?", 75 percent of the TV spectators say that they know about TPT's existence.

Because it is possible that people do not know the precise name of TPT but that they, however, go to the TV school each Wednesday and Friday we asked the question: "Do you watch the TPT braodcasts at present?" Combining the answers to this question and to Question 49 we find that only 12 percent of those who participate in the TPT sessions were, when directly asked, not aware of the name of the TPT broadcasts.

In contrast we can also investigate how many people among those who know (theoretically) about TPT's existence report that they actually watch TPT, assuming that those who know about TPT are more likely to watch TPT. We find that more than three-fourths of those who say that they know about TPT actually participate. Twenty-two percent of the 214 TPT "knowers" do not participate.

We are aware that these responses must be treated with caution. Therefore, we attempted to verify the responses concerning "TPT knowledge" and "TPT participation" by creating a new composite variable, which will be explained in the following section.

5.3.3. Verification of TPT watching

By selecting the respondents who watch TV in the local school, who watch the kind of TV programs usually presented by TPT, and who say that they

watch TV on Wednesdays and Fridays, we obtain a new variable. This variable tries to control on the level of actual behavior the responses about watching TPT. For we can imagine that the responses for "Do you watch TPT?" are only expressions of intention.

Actually 78 percent of the TV spectators who say that they watch TPT confirm by their behavior that they go to the TV school on Wednesdays and Fridays and that they, among other things, watch TPT type programs.

Because this verification provided positive results, analysis of the January TPT audience characteristics is based on the responses to the question: "Do you watch TPT?"

5.3.4. Reasons for not watching TPT

The reasons given by the TV spectators for not, or not anymore, watching of the TPT broadcasts (Q. 42, January), are not real "negative motivations" but rather simple excuse formulas such as "I do not have time" (31 percent) or "I am tired" (54 percent). (See also Section 4.2.2.). The reasons for not coming to TPT are almost the same as those for not watching the general TV programs. There is nothing specific about TPT which causes people not to watch the TPT broadcasts. For example, nobody mentions the TPT broadcast time or the TPT content as reasons for his or her absence.

5.3.5. Non-TPT spectators

Half of the respondents who are not part of the actual TPT audience reply in the affirmative when asked whether they watched TPT before (Q. 51, January). Among the 80 respondents who do not (anymore) watch TPT, 30 percent have never watched, but 54 percent have watched. Sixteen percent do not give an answer.

In January 192 persons respond that they watched TPT (see Table 6). If one adds to these persons the 43 respondents who say that they have watched

TPT in the past, we obtain a total of 235 people in our TV village sample who, recently or not, have been exposed to one or more TPT programs. If this figure of 235 is related to the total of 298 TV spectators almost 80 percent of the TV audience has been reached by a TPT message at one moment or another. And this may indicate, once more, that the TPT audience is rather fluctuating and that few people watch all the time (see also Section 4.2.3.).

It is important to remind the reader that because of the sampling procedures used these results have only an illustrative value and that they should not be generalized to the adult population of the entire rural area of the Ivory Coast. It is very likely that the IIOP (1975) data cited by Fritz (1976 : 17) are closer to the reality. There it is stated that 82 percent of the rural population has never seen any of the TPT broadcasts. The question of the size of the TPT audience will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.4.2., where it is dealt with on the basis of answers by the 16 TV school directors in the interviews held with them in January and April (see Sections 2.4.2.2. and 2.4.3.3.).

5.3.6. Regularity of TPT watching

It was observed before that among the TV spectators 64 percent watch the TPT broadcasts. Here we can add the following precision: it is among those who most regularly watch TV that there is the largest possibility to find TPT spectators. But, in contrast, because the largest proportion of TV spectators watch TV only "from time to time" (Section 4.2.3.), the largest percentage of TPT viewers remains in the category of occasional TV spectators. Sixty-eight percent of the TPT audience say that they watch "from time to time" or "occasionally".

Also, the distribution of the TPT audience over the different frequency or regularity categories is similar to the TV audience distribution.

This shows, once more, that the TPT viewers do not have anything particular in their viewing habits which distinguishes them from the other TV spectators.

It has also been said previously that the total TV audience is in constant flux and is thus renewing itself constantly. Could the same conclusion be drawn concerning the TPT audience? This question will be answered in the following section.

5.3.7. The TPT viewing group

The local TPT listening or viewing group remains a point of controversy. Some research reports mention it, others remain skeptical with respect to its existence per se. The TPT "animator booklet" mentioned by Benveniste (1976 : 31) defines the viewing group as a "regular" group. We attempted to verify the existence of such groups in the TV villages through a variable which combines all the respondents who at the same time regularly watch TPT, in the local school, on Wednesdays and Fridays. With this new variable we find that among 51 TPT spectators who say that they watch very regularly,[4] there are only 13 people who respond to the two other criteria of watching in the school and on Wednesdays and Fridays. If a viewing group is primarily defined by the regularity of its members then it is difficult to see how these 13 people, who are living in different villages, could form a real "viewing group".

We find that in each of the following villages there is one "very regular" TPT spectator: Kébi, Siélokaha, Tiaha, Torosanguéi. In two villages, Kouaméziankro and Koumoudji there are two "very regulars" each. There is only one village, Kongoti, where we find a group of five "very regular" TPT viewers.

We could wonder whether these five "very regular" TPT spectators in Kongoti are the core of a regular viewing group. If so, it would be the only

case in the 16 TV villages. Thus, the research findings suggest that there are probably none or few TV schools where at the present moment an active regular TPT viewing group operates. This conclusion coincides with the conclusions of Benveniste (1976 : 95) that "there is no selection of adults .... and no homogeneous group".

5.3.8. Before the TPT session

5.3.8.1. Notification

Fritz (1976 : 21) notes that according to the results of the feedback system "almost all animators report to have notified the population for all the broadcasts." Our study should logically arrive at the same conclusion: almost all TPT spectators should have been systematically informed about the date and the subject of future TPT broadcasts. Actually, this is not the case as is shown in Table 7. It appears that for more than half the TPT spectators,

TABLE 5-7

"Do You Know In Advance The Subject Of Each TPT Broadcast?"

	N	%
No	109	57
Yes	82	43
Total number of TPT spectators	191	100

the prior notification for the TPT programs does not take place anymore[5]. However, it seems evident that quite some respondents have not answered "strictu senso" to the question, "Do you know in advance the subject of each TPT broadcast?" but rather to a question of the following type: "Are you informed about a TPT broad-

cast each time it will take place, with the possibility of a notification when the TPT session does not take place?"

5.3.8.2. Notification channels

All prior studies emphasize the fact that the means which are used most for announcing the TPT programs are the school pupils. In the January questionnaire we asked how TPT spectators got to know about the (subject of the) TPT program. The distribution of the responses is presented in Table 8.

TABLE 5-8

By What Means Do You Know In Advance About The Subject Of Each TPT Broadcast?

	N	%
The school pupils	46	56
Radio	14	17
Authorities and/or radio and/or newspapers	6	7
Teacher/animator	16	20
Total number of TPT spectators who are informed about TPT in advance	82	100

In a similar fashion as in the preceding section (5.3.8.1.) the responses in this Table should rather be interpreted as answers to the following question: "Are you informed in advance about an upcoming TPT broadcast. If yes, how?" than as answers to the question in the title of Table 8.

Here we would like to add a remark about the use of radio which, although not the medium referred to used most by the respondents, plays however a significant role. Taking into account the large actual and potential radio

audience in the rural areas[6], it is imperative that the TPT department should use the radio much more systematically (either for announcing the TPT programs or even for broadcasting other educational programs) instead of making the school teachers/animators responsible for notifying the villagers about the TPT braodcasts. This point is also stressed by Benveniste (1976 : 47). (See also the last chapter on Recommendations.)

5.3.9. During the TPT session

5.3.9.1. Existence of TPT animation

In contrast to many previous observations, in January only 5 percent of the TPT spectators reported that there was no animation in their school. We thought that this positive finding was influenced by the formulation of the question (Q. 57) which implicitly assumed that animation was taking place. Therefore we asked a more explicit question in April: "Since January, what happens immediately after the TPT broadcasts?" (Q. 35). We expected that the responses would be closer to our field experience that there is less unanimity with respect to the existence of animation. The distribution of responses is presented in Table 9. Must we infer from this table that the animation of the TPT programs goes according to plan in the villages? The responses do not provide a direct answer. Moreover, we could wonder what the 65 people mean who say that they go home after watching the TPT broadcast. Is this because the animation is not interesting for them or because it does not exist at all?

It should be noted that the answers of the TPT spectators concerning animation correspond well with the reports of the TV school directors (see Section 5.4.). On the basis of the interviews with the school directors it was established that in 7 out of the 16 TV schools there is regular animation.

The individual responses indicate that in almost half the cases animation is still taking place.

TABLE 5-9

"Since January, What Happens Immediately After The TPT Broadcasts?"

	N	%
Animation	64	46
Watch the following broadcast	8	6
Go home	65	47
It varies	1	0
Total number of TPT spectators who responded to this question	138	100

The following sections give an idea of the way in which the animation sessions operate.

5.3.9.2. TPT spectators' interest in animation and discussion

The recent Regional Education Study in its report No. 7, titled "Alpha-Media" (Ivory Coast Republic, 1976) remarks that the animation sessions following the TPT programs to a large extent contribute to the educational image of the TPT broadcasts. Moreover, in Section 5.3.10 we will see that 60 percent of the TPT spectators think that TV's purpose is to instruct people. Therefore it is not surprising to find that 77 percent of the TPT viewers feel that the discussions after TPT are interesting, "because they clarify certain notions" as the respondents say.

Fifteen TPT spectators indicate their interest for the animation by the fact that they personally and actively engage in the discussion. And when all the TPT spectators are directly asked: "Do you talk during the discussion?"

(Q. 60, January) the responses confirm the result of the question in the previous paragraph. But only 9 percent of the TPT spectators say that they talk "very often" during the discussion, as is indicated in Table 10.

TABLE 5-10

"Do You Talk During These Discussions

Very Often, Sometimes Or Never?

	N	%
Very often	17	9
Sometimes	58	30
Never	77	40
There is no discussion	2	1
No answer	37	19
Total number of TPT spectators	191	100

If one is of the opinion that the essential function of the animation is to get people actively involved in the discussion, that is: to get them to explain the communal and personal "needs", and to prepare the TPT participants for action, the TPT animation, defined as such, does not work well. But if one adopts a realistic point of view, one has to admit that TPT animation done by school teachers who are not or very little trained in animation techniques, cannot but be a discussion with a pedagogical and directive character, instead of being a participatory discovery. Our research results confirm once more this typical "schooling" character of the TPT animation sessions.

5.3.10. TV's role according to TPT spectators

The study of Questions 47 and 53 of the January questionnaire (asked of all TV spectators, and not only TPT viewers) is an attempt to obtain

some insight in the motivations of the respondents why they come and watch the TPT broadcasts, and to find out whether TPT serves an educational or entertainment function.

As anncunced in the preceding section we find the highest percentage of TPT viewers (79 percent) among those TV watching respondents who give priority to the educational role of television. In contrast, the TPT audience forms only 44 percent of the TV spectators who stress the entertainment aspect of the television. If we look at the TPT audience alone we find the distribution of answers as presented in Table 11.

TABLE 5-11

Number of TPT spectators who think that TV serves the purpose of instruction and/or entertainment

	N	%
Instruction	113	60
Instruction and entertainment	42	22
Entertainment	11	6
Instruction of children	7	4
Other responses	15	8
Total number of TPT spectators	188	100

The results correspond with those of previous reports and in particular with the Benveniste (1976) report, which notes in the village of Anno: "The reasons which motivate the villagers to watch TPT refer to the educational potential of the TV," (page 61). We have observed that relatively few peasants mention the entertainment role of TPT. It is very likely that they did not dare to do so because TPT has an image of "seriousness" and not

of "entertainment". The alternative "entertainment versus instruction" is maintained by the teacher-animators when they accuse the peasant of not taking the TV serious. This alternative coincides with the opposition between two educational models: one which consists of passively receiving information, the other which is based on the active participation in the educational process. This opposition still exists despite the encouragement by the TPT department to create a listening group prepared to undertake action. This is once more confirmed by the contradiction among the peasants themselves: on the one hand they express a certain theoretical interest in TPT, while on the other hand there is a very small active group (9 percent) during the animation-discussion session.

5.4. Size of TPT audience

5.4.1. Size of national TPT audience over time

In the past efforts have been made to measure the size of the TPT audience. Based on a large national sample of schools the feedback system (see Fritz, 1976) was able to provide figures about the number of participants for all the TPT programs from 1974 until 1976. Extrapolating these figures and taking into account the number of TV schools where effective animation took place for a particular broadcast, it was possible to estimate the total national attendance as well as the average number of participants per school. Table 12 gives an overview of some of these national figures. We observe that despite the increase in the total number of TV schools there is not a proportional increase in the numbers of schools opened for animation as well as the annual average number of spectators. Moreover, there is a definite decline in the proportion of the target group with access to a TV school, which is exposed to the TPT programs that are reported by animators in feedback forms.

TABLE 5-12

National TPT audience figures for the years 1973-1977

Year	Total No. of TV schools	Range of TV schools with animation	Average No. of participants	% of target population reached *
1973	700	35	2,520	--
1973-74	950	135-160	13,090	5.0
1974-75	1,152	65-468	16,024	5.0
1975-76	1,481	81-566	15,725	3.3
1976-77	1,652	41-406	5,296	.9

*Target population with access to TV school: 319,280 in 1974-75
471,720 in 1975-76
571,960 in 1976-77

Source: Fritz, 1976 and Lenglet (forthcoming).

NOTE: The target population with access to a TV school is estimated on the basis of four variables: the number of rural TV schools times the estimated average total number of inhabitants in a village with a TV school in a given year, and the number of urban TV schools times the estimated average total number of inhabitants living in the neighborhood of an urban TV school. We assume that only the persons of 15 years and older but under 60 should be considered potential TPT spectators. This group forms about 47 percent of the total population. Therefore the target population with access to a TV school is 47% of the total population with access to a TV school.

It has also been observed that during the school year the attendance figures tend to become smaller after the maximum number of participants has been reached in December and January. Hypotheses have been formulated which link the existence of an annual listening curve which goes upward during the first quarter (October - December) and then goes downward, from January to June. This curve has been observed in the feedback data for 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77. The most plausible explanation says that in the first quarter of the school year the animator as well as the audience are still freshly motivated to open the school and animate the listening group and to come and discuss the TPT programs. This initial enthusiasm wears off, especially in the second and third quarters. Reasons for this must probably be found in the other activities of the animator and the villagers. In the second half of the school year many of the animators have to work for their own professional exams, and also many of them are devoting supplementary hours for preparing 6th grade students for sitting for the secondary school entrance exam. For the villagers the last few months before the rainy season, which starts in April, mean additional agricultural work of preparing the fields and plantations. When the rainy season begins in April quite often the rains prevent the villagers from going to school to watch TV. And we have the personal experience that, when it is raining, the sound of the TV programs is almost unaudible due to the noise of the rain on the corrugated roofs of the school.

5.4.2. Size of TPT audience: survey results and discussion

That there is no massive audience for the TPT programs, that not all schools are open for animation, and that there is a decline of interest over time is also confirmed by various other studies (Benveniste, 1976,

Lenglet, 1976, and Grant and Seya, 1976) as well as by personal observations. It is once more confirmed through the January and April interviews with school directors and TPT animators[7], and through personal observation during the 1977 survey. On the basis of these interviews we found that in 14 out of the 16 TV villages the TV is switched on at least on Wednesday and Friday evenings, the usual TPT nights. However, we also found that according to the director or animator, in only 7 out of 16 TV villages regular animation (translation of the TV programs, and discussions afterwards) takes place.

In January the school directors estimated that the TPT programs usually attract a total of 559 spectators or, on the average, 35 spectators per school. Thirty-five spectators per classroom or school may seem low in comparison with an average of 61 spectators during the entire Water Series (64 for the first Water Series and 53 for the second one[8]) but it follows the downward trend of in between 57 and 45 spectators (average) during 1975-76 and the 88-38 range for 1976-77[9] as reported by the feedback data.

The number of 35 spectators per classroom was estimated during the pre-survey. In the post-survey we asked the school director whether he thought that since January the number of participants had decreased or increased or whether it had remained stable. Nine directors said that it had decreased, 5 said that their TPT audience had increased, and 2 directors reported a stable audience. It is difficult to ascertain the complete veracity of these estimates. When the school directors report an increase in the number of participants he may want to make a good impression on the interviewer. Though it should be remarked immediately that 9 out of 16 directors reported a "negative" fact: a diminishing audience. And if indeed in more than half of all 16 cases, during a relatively short period of three months, the audience size has diminished, even after our survey visits, which would supposedly positively affect the TPT

activities in the village, then we can be somewhat confident that in the sample villages the overall interest in TPT has certainly not increased. There is a probability that it has decreased.

A problem in interpreting attendance figures is that they are always reported by the animators themselves. It has been observed that animators have a tendency to over-estimate the number of their spectators. Moreover, they tend to report not only the number of adults over 15 years old -- and this is the age group of the TPT target audience -- but to include the small children as well, who, not uncommonly, form often half or two-thirds of the listening group (Benveniste, 1976 and personal observation). If we want to have an idea about the extent to which the target audience is reached by the TPT programs, we should limit our analyses to the adult spectators.

The observed declining trend in attendence figures may be due to several factors. First, the high figures in 1974-75 and the lower figures thereafter could indicate the operation of a novelty effect with TV arriving for the first time for adult villagers. But later after evening TV became normal this novelty naturally wore off. Secondly, the high figures for the Water Series which came early in TPT existence (1975) could be explained by the campaign approach of the programs: organized around a single highly relevant subject and progressively covering all aspects of it, these programs may have had the beneficial effect of attracting and also holding a larger audience than ordinary TPT programs can and do. Usually TPT programs have shifting themes, which are not always relevant for the total target audience and tend to discourage the spectators[10].

Let us accept, for the 1977 survey, that the reported 559 spectators are all adults. If all 16 schools are open and assuming that at least one

classroom is used for TPT watching, and setting the theoretical capacity of an ordinary classroom at 40 seats, then the estimated usual audience in the 16 TV villages is using almost completely the available capacity. Eighty-four percent of the seats are occupied. However, if the capacity is set at 60 places (seats, standing places and sitting on the floor included) -- and this is the more common practice in many schools -- then a little more than half of the capacity is used (58 percent). Given the fact that all TV schools have at least two receivers which can operate independently and simultaneously[11] the capacity for watching TPT is enlarged: 1280 to 1920 places depending on whether one assumes 40 seats or 60 places per classroom. Thus, in the case of two TV receivers operating, only 29 to 44 percent of the capacity is effectively used.

The proportion of capacity used is just one aspect of TPT participation. If we assume that all the adults in villages with a TV school, excluding the very old and the disabled, form the target population of the TPT broadcasts then about 47 percent of the total village population (18,019), or 8,469 people are supposed to be reached. Taking the seat capacity as a criterion then only 15 to 23 percent of this target audience could be accommodated in the schools (with two classrooms opened for animation). This would indicate that there is a physical constraint on the number of people that can be reached by TPT. And it suggests that one should look for other arrangements, such as the opening of more classrooms or the moving of the TV set into the open air, to allow a larger part of the target group to participate, if it is motivated to do so. We have seen, however, that the present capacity is certainly not used up to its limits, and this indicates that there are other, and probably more important reasons than the limited space, why people do not attend the TPT sessions. Some of these have been analyzed in previous documents[12].

One remark should be made here. When we analyze the seat capacity and the actual TPT audience and the proportion of the TPT target population reached, we implicitly assume that the objective of the TPT programs is to reach as large a number as possible. However, the strategy of the OSTV itself has not clearly addressed the question of quantitative goals. Because any service can only hope to attain a certain percentage of the potential audience, it is not immediately clear whether the small TPT audience numbers correspond to the implicitly set quantitative goal of the OSTV.

A comparison of the total potential audience of 8,469 people with the actual audience size of 559 spectators shows that 6.6 percent of the target group is reached. This figures corresponds well with the 1974-75 and 1975-76 feedback figures reported in Table 12, especially when we allow for the fact that the school directors or animators, because of our presence, have possibly reported inflated figures. The 6.6 percent figure does not correspond well with the 1976-77 feedback figures reported in Table 12. But here we should take into account, first, that the feedback figures are national estimates for all TV schools which - on the basis of the same feedback data - are thought to have been opened during the year. Moreover, these estimates are averages with a large margin of variation and error. Thus, the reported .9 percent (Table 12) of the target population with access to a TV school reached could be higher, and closer to the 6.6 percentage found in the 16 TV villages of our sample. Secondly, it should be realized that the 1976-77 figures are for the total season, while our interview took place in January just after the quarter with usually the highest attendance figures. Indeed the national estimate of the average number of participants during the first quarter of 1976-77 is 10,789, which equals to two percent of the target population with access to a TV school. And thirdly, the animators in the TV

villages were especially sensitized to animating TPT, and thus to attracting more people than usual, by our request for a list with the names of spectators and by the letters announcing our research (Section 2.5.4.).

As far as TPT audience size is concerned we have tried to provide as positive as possible a picture based on conservative estimates, i.e., estimates that give a wide margin of credit to the TPT system. We have assumed that TPT animation took place in all the 16 TV villages and that in the audience numbers reported the children had been excluded. If we assume that the children were included, and if we -- in a similar vein -- include the children between the ages of 8 and 15 in the target group, then TPT would be aimed at 80 percent of the population, or 14,415 people. And in that case the actual reach of the TPT programs would be only 3.9 percent of the target group. Whatever the assumptions it remains a fact -- also in the 16 TV villages -- that only a small group of TPT spectators can be found.

REFERENCES

1. See Appendix I for the distribution of the various ethnic groups, in the sample villages.
2. Fritz, 1976, Lenglet, 1976, IIOP, 1975, and Seya and Yao, 1977, and the January survey.
3. This conclusion could also be reversed: The only chance one has to watch TV is on the TPT evenings. Then one comes first for the RTI programs, and one is "obliged" to watch the TPT programs as well.
4. The "very regular" category comprises those who watch "each time" and "regularly".
5. In 1973-74 61 percent of 260 animators interviewed said that they notified personally the village audience. Kaye and Lenglet, 1975 : 35.
6. See Seya and Yao, 1977.
7. The data provided by the 16 TV school directors (Sections 2.4.2.2. and 2.4.3.3.) should not be confused with the data from the individual questionnaires (Sections 2.4.2.1. and 2.4.3.1.). Section 5.3.6. deals with the latter data. This section discusses the former data.
8. Lenglet, 1976.
9. Especially the 1976-77 feedback figures must be interpreted with great care because of the much more limited return of feedback forms than in previous years. We feel that this low return is due to the declining interest of the animators, despite (or because of?) the fact that all primary school teachers by ministerial order are supposed to do TPT animation.
10. See Lenglet and McAnany, 1977, for a comparison of i.a. Tanzania's Radio Study Campaign approach and Ivory Coast's out-of-school TV model.

See also Jamison and McAnany, 1977, for a classification of the different "radio strategies".

11. Often two or three receivers are hooked to the same set of batteries allowing only one receiver to be operating at any one moment.

12. See Benveniste, 1976, Grant and Seya, 1976, Yao, 1976.

CHAPTER VI

TPT IMPACT

6.1. The effect of TPT: actions claimed

6.1.1. Introduction

In order to assess the impact of the TPT programs, both in January and in April, we asked the TPT viewers a few coded questions followed by some open questions. Our concern was eventually to determine which kind of TPT viewers were more likely to follow TPT advice. Furthermore, we wished to ascertain more precisely which actions or decisions were undertaken as a consequence of TPT viewing. The TPT spectators were asked the following questions in the January and April surveys:

1) Whether, in their opinion, TPT had given advice which had helped them in an action relevant to the topic and, if so, which one (Questions 72, 73, January);
2) Whether they applied TPT advice. If not, why not; if yes, which one (Questions 80 to 83, January);
3) Whether, since January, TPT programs led them to make decisions; if yes, what had they decided to do, what had they accomplished and what had they not yet been able to accomplish (Questions 37 to 39, April).

Compared to the first two sets of questions relating to an overall impact, the third set was designed to study specifically the impact of TPT programs between January and April.

As we will see, determining which groups among the TPT audience were the most favorably oriented towards TPT programs is not much of a problem; but this does not answer the more difficult question of the relationship between those who like to watch TPT and the impact of these programs. But our main

difficulties appear when we try to determine what actions or decisions have been taken by TPT spectators. We will have to discuss later in more detail the problem of the validity of the answers and the verification of that which the respondents claimed to have done.

6.1.2. The "active" TPT spectators

Before presenting the data, we would like to make two remarks. Generally, the peasants do not like to admit that they have not accomplished anything or not followed the advice of TPT. Consequently, we can expect that the total number of positive answers to the questions about TPT impact is exaggerated. In fact, often their claimed actions are no more than an intent. Indeed, we discovered an almost complete absence of the distinction between "action", "decision" or "intention". It was as if the decision to do something or even the willingness to do so was a "fait accompli".

We can say that 106 TPT watchers out of 131, that is more than one half of the TPT spectators, claimed to have been helped in some way by TPT advice; to have applied TPT advice; and to have made some decisions influenced by the suggestions of TPT. Our main interest at this point is to find if these people have some characteristics which can differentiate them from the rest of the TPT audience.

6.1.2.1. Characteristics of "active" TPT watchers

The first thing which appears from our data is that neither age, sex, social status nor group membership play any role in how people react to TPT programs (see the same conclusions in Section 5.2. on TPT audience characteristics). However, it is possible to distinguish among TPT viewers according to their ethnic group, religion, profession, income and their degree of education. Although, in large part, data concerning impact do not give conclu-

sions that are statistically significant, we are able to delineate certain tendencies.

Our findings may be summarized as follows: the two ethnic groups of the Lagoon and the Dan, the planters, Christians, the more educated and high income people, are those more favorably oriented toward the TPT programs.

6.1.3. Access, exposure and interest in animation

In the TPT audience characteristics (see Section 5.2.), we found that the wealthy planters and the more educated peasants are present in relatively greater numbers at TPT sessions than the rest of the TPT audience.

Therefore, we might expect more positive answers to questions concerning impact from these two groups; this assumption is verified most of the time. Another logical assumption would be that the more one regularly attends TPT sessions, the more one is influenced to action by TPT. But we do not find any kind of relationship between the regularity of TPT watching and the positive acceptance of TPT advice, i.e., the degree of exposure does not seem to be related to TPT impact.

Interest in animation

Our strongest relationship was established between TPT impact (in terms of "actions" or "decisions") and the interest in the animation. We find a larger number of positive attitudes towards the advice given by TPT among those spectators who said they were interested in the discussions that took place immediately after TPT broadcasts.

6.1.4. Actions claimed or decisions

At the end of the surveys, we did a content analysis of the answers to the open-ended questions about impact (for the precise questions, see Section 6.1.1.). We ended up with two lists, a first one for the actions, a

second one for the decisions people said they were going to take as a consequence of TPT viewing either in January or in April. Whatever list we consider, it has these two characteristics: each list covers all the major subjects treated in TPT programs, which is at least an indication of the familiarity of respondents with TPT broadcasts; approximately one-half of the claimed actions or decisions were in the area of agriculture. Although "agricultural" programs form less than 25 percent of all the TPT programs since 1973, they are the largest single category (see Table 2 below). Therefore we may account for the large number of agricultural actions claimed either by the relative weight given to agriculture in the TPT programs and/or by the simple fact that agriculture is the vital issue for most rural people.

Finally, a few items emerge from the analysis of the open questions that indicate problems of interpretation of the responses. For example, when respondents mention actions, they may say: "to wear boots", "to filter water", "to build latrines", "to be vaccinated" or "cooperatives". There are three problems with the interpretation of such typical answers. First is the problem of interpreting what the respondent is saying: are cooperatives to be created? Is a water filter to be purchased? Is a vaccination to be consented to or actually received? Second, are these simply reports of what the respondent would like to do or are they reports of actual activities? Third, if they are actions carried out, how much is attributable to TPT programs?

We had such questions in mind when, after the first survey, we decided to try to verify the 22 self-reported actions that respondents attributed to TPT. Consequently in April we used a check list of the 22 "actions" which had been claimed in January. Significantly, when we examined

reported actions more closely, we could not find any evidence of one action undertaken as a consequence of TPT viewing, among the 22 actions we checked. Rather than start a long discussion of what this means, it may be more appropriate to illustrate our point with a few anecdotes.

Wearing boots was recommended during the Water Series programs in 1975-76, especially for rice growers, so as not to expose their legs and feet to disease-bearing organisms in the water. Upon questioning, the boots were discovered to be shoes, worn walking to and from the fields as protection against snakes. A sound precaution, but an action which might be inaccurately interpreted without such a probing follow-up. When a subject who claimed he used a water filter was interrogated with a "do you mind if we see it?", he retorted laughingly, "Well, it doesn't work." When a subject declared he had built a latrine, the interviewer asked him if he could go see it. The response was, "Well, I intend to build a latrine, but my rice fields have kept me so busy lately." Actions in the cooperatives are seen to be simple, long-standing participation in a cooperative movement, not any new action triggered by a TPT program. Vaccinations are accomplished in a mandatory fashion whenever a medical team arrives in the village, not according to any person's will or personal initiative.

It appears from those few examples that positive responses about action reflect more of intention (and retention of the recommended message) than applied actions. Most of the answers of the TPT audience can be interpreted as either expressions of adhesion to the idea of modernity or evidence that some spectators had retained the lessons of what actions are being encouraged by the government.

In the April survey (Question 40), people were asked what should be done next with the TPT programs. The most prevalent answers among regular

viewers was for programs concerning topics like animal husbandry and creation of more farm land. This indicates that rural people are more interested in income generating topics than those that deal with social services like health or education. Still, the responses may be due to the fact that animal husbandry and farm creation were recent topics aired on TPT and not due to the peasant's lack of enough cash income. In this case, the suggestions for future programs are more of a proof of viewers' retention of TPT topics than a reflection of peasants' concerns.

6.1.5. Obstacles to action

In the course of our surveys, we found two main obstacles to follow-up actions being expressed by respondents: one more of a socio-political nature, reflecting how rural society, decision-making and action are structured and limited; the other was of an economic kind, indicating that actions often cost money which peasants may simply not have. The socio-political structure, for example, qualifies certain persons to share in decision making while excluding others. Women and the young would generally be less able to make decisions. For those with some decision-making power, the men, the creation of additional traditional fields seems to be the most "popular" decision. Also, there is a custom among villages that the chief, the father or the elder brother would have greater authority. How much of their structure influences the general lack of TPT follow-up action and how much is due to a lack of money?

In the April survey (Question 26) an attempt was made to check which actions the respondents can personally decide to undertake and which requires "authorities" or money to decide. Responses indicated that almost three-fourths of the respondents could not do anything on their own. But the majority of answers from another part of the April survey (Question 41)

seems to indicate that this lack of action potential was due more to economic than socio-political limitations. Most cited is lack of cash as the main obstacle to action and not because a chief or older male figure would not agree to the action.

A last remark can be made at this point. If the lack of money were the only obstacle to action, why are there not more actions which do not require money, for example in the areas of health? Obviously there is a contradiction. Rural spectators are not interested in actions that do not generate cash income, but that they easily could undertake. In contrast, actions which promise economic returns, require an initial money investment, which the peasants do not have. Thus, they will not start such actions. This vicious circle of poverty could explain the "resistence to innovation" of the "traditional" peasant.

As a conclusion to this section, we can say that there is no evidence to indicate more than minimal impact of TPT programs on its audience in terms of stimulation of decisions and action. But we can recognize a "complicity" in a money oriented activity. That is, where actions have been claimed, there seems to exist in the individual the knowledge that certain activities are profitable. We will explore in more detail this point in the following section.

6.2. Memory impact

6.2.1. Introduction

In the previous section we showed that the actions claimed to have been undertaken as a consequence of TPT were purely "intentions". We also suggested the possibility that the intentions were only "retentions" (see Section 6.4.1.). Different ways of programming seem to play their role in increasing the retention of TPT broadcast material among TPT watchers.

In January as in April, one precoded question was asked of the TPT viewers about the subjects which had been treated on TPT (Question 33, January; 54, April). The interviewers waited for spontaneous answers and checked the corresponding box if they coincided with subjects that had been broadcast.

6.2.2. Long term effect: overall retention

From the January survey we find the recall data reported in Table 1 with the following results: agriculture programs were most often suggested in the free recall, next were water programs, then grouped together were employment, savings and housing; animal husbandry was last.

6.2.2.1. Recall of TPT themes

Agriculture

If we look at Appendix K for the complete 1976-77 list of TPT programs, we notice that in this year there were a number of reruns for instance "the choice of a land for a plantation" (classified in our list as a TPT program on agriculture) had first been broadcast in June 1973. This fact might partially explain the high rate of recall for agriculture; but it is far less important than the general perception of TPT itself among peasants that it is television especially meant for themselves (Grant and Seya, 1976 : 15). It is obvious that the large number of broadcasts about agriculture created since 1973 has influenced both the perception of TPT and the level of recall for agriculture. From a report by Grant (1977, Appendix C) we find evidence about the weight given to agricultural subject matters in the TPT programming. We find that the TPT programs on agriculture represent about 20 percent of the total number of broadcasts since the beginning of the project in 1973. One can speak here of a "repetition" effect, viewers

TABLE 6-1

Recall of TPT subject areas in January and April

(By the TPT viewers who answered to Q. 33, January)

	TPT on animal raising		TPT on housing		TPT on water problems		TPT on savings		TPT on employment		TPT on agriculture	
No	146	89%	115	70%	71	43%	116	71%	109	66%	48	29%
Yes	11	7%	43	26%	87	53%	42	26%	49	30%	110	67%
No answer	7	4%	6	4%	6	4%	6	3%	6	4%	6	4%
Total	164	100%	164	100%	164	100%	164	100%	164	100%	164	100%

Retention of TPT subject areas

(By the TPT viewers who answered to Q. 54, April)

	TPT on animal raising		TPT on housing		TPT on water problems		TPT on savings		TPT on handicrafts		TPT on youth education	
No	48	26%	73	40%	60	33%	93	51%	94	51%	103	56%
No	120	66%	94	51%	105	57%	66	36%	62	34%	53	29%
No answer	15	8%	16	9%	18	10%	24	13%	27	15%	27	15%
Total	183	100%	183	100%	183	100%	183	100%	183	100%	183	100%

probably tend to recall agriculture programs more because they have seen many more of them than other kinds of programs. We must not forget that in the previous section, we reported that one-half of actions reportedly undertaken were in the agricultural sectors. The conclusion is clear: TPT has placed emphasis on agriculture and, not surprisingly, rural people whose main work is in this area have responded.

TABLE 6-2

TPT programs subjects 1973-1977

Subject areas	Total programs
Agriculture	25
Health	19
Water	16
Folklore, traditions	13
Housing	9
Education	8
Savings	7
Livestock raising	7
Urban life	6
Labor	3
Environment	3
Miscellaneous	12
Total	128

Water problems

As we can also see in Table 2 the TPT Water Series has high relevance for viewers. Consequently it is not surprising to find the Water programs among the topics which have the highest recall rate (after agriculture) in the

January survey. Especially when we know that most of the rural people are constantly faced with serious water problems. In another section of this paper (7.5.5.), we report that "water problems" are the most often mentioned problems in the rural areas. Even though the Water Series was done about a year to a year and a half before the 1977 surveys, people still recalled the series. One can speak here of a long term effect which seems to confirm the assumption that a TV series based on a campaign is more successful than an independent series of programs that have no relation to activities by other agencies.

Up to this point, we have dealt only with the recall of TPT themes or subject areas. In addition, we would like to examine in more detail the content of some programs, and specifically about recall of the advice included in the program format from the beginning.

6.2.2.2. Recall of TPT advice

In the January survey (Questions 72/73) we asked TPT viewers whether they could remember any advice given by the programs they had watched. Results for the total sample showed the following:

Area of advice	Number of respondents
Water supply, water cleanliness	81
Health, hygiene	79
Agriculture	57
Savings, budgeting	37
Livestock raising	25
Rural exodus	20
Cooperatives	19
Modern Housing	19
Jobs	16

In all categories, many examples of advice were very general, but some were quite specific. In the area of hygiene eleven spectators declared that homes and courtyards should be kept clean; one stated that you should destroy places where mosquito larvae could breed. Another discouraged throwing garbage in the courtyard or the river. In housing, seventeen spectators lauded the idea of constructing new, modern houses; one had learned to use the plumbline as a valuable technique. There was often quite a range of examples of advice within any chosen area. In savings and budget, we found the following recall of the following items: be foresighted, don't waste money, spend your money wisely, don't live beyond your means, save your money, put your money in the bank, don't keep too much money around the house. If we look at the responses village by village, we can detect which pieces of advice appear the most widely spread.

Piece of advice	Number of villages where mentioned
Filter water	14
Build modern houses	11
Build a latrine	7
Put money into the bank	6
Keep the house and yard clean	6
Learn a profession	5
Raise livestock	5
Return to work in the village	5
Dig a well	5
Maintain a good plantation	5

In general TPT advice gets through to the audience. In every village a long list of things to do or not to do can be rattled off. Often, however, the

advice is general, such as "hygiene" or "plantations," thus revealing that some spectators know perfectly well the general development goals that the government is pushing them toward. In this respect, as a sensitization program, TPT seems to have potential.

6.2.1.2. A short term effect: TPT recall January - April

We have examined what TPT viewers recalled best when surveyed in January. In a sense it was a recall of all previous TPT programs. In April, however, we had an opportunity of measuring recall more specifically between the first and second surveys, a period of about three months. One series we were especially interested in was one on animal husbandry which broadcast four of the seven planned programs in the series between the end of January and the end of February, 1977 (Appendix C for full list).

When we examine the recall figures from the April survey (Table 1), we find that the highest recall for TPT programs is animal husbandry. People were more likely to recall the titles of TPT programs on animal raising than on other topics. We can suggest several reasons why this would happen: first, the programs presented a step by step method for animal care and raising and related it closely to profit making, something, as we have seen, that TPT viewers are most interested in; second, the element of the recency of the programs (about one month or so before the survey) would also help account for high recall.

The second best recalled topic in April, as in January, was water. We remember that the Water Series was first presented as part of a national action campaign (Lenglet, 1976) and had made a considerable impact at that time. A number of programs from the series were also repeated which may help account for the high recall of the topic.

As a conclusion to this section on the impact of recall and retention of TPT program topics, we should underline the following: 1) that TPT seems to have best results when TV programs are part of a longer series; 2) that the reruns of former series programs also seem to reinforce recall; and 3) that programs giving specific advice seem to be recalled best.

6.2.4. Animal husbandry: a case study

We would like to examine in more detail the impact of the livestock raising series because it was the only one which was measured in both surveys and therefore provides us with some small measure of control for effects. In April we found that 69 of 120 TPT spectators (or 58 percent) were able to recall at least one of four of the programs that had been presented. Moreover, 26 (or 22 percent) were totally correct in their answers, identifying the four animals of the TPT programs. Once more we can underline a relatively good rate of retention.

However, when the same 120 spectators were asked if they were going to apply the modern animal raising methods they had learned, very few of them wanted to answer the question. Twenty-eight out of 120 (or 23 percent) responded that they did not have the initial capital for adopting this new technique. Moreover, the majority of the respondents emphasized the need of an extension agent to help them. Also, they were so conscious of the difficulties they would have in obtaining the support of the village chief and the sub-prefect in the enterprise that they finally admitted they they were not at all ready to begin any modern livestock enterprise.

There was one more aspect of the animal raising series that needs mention. As we mentioned in Chapter II, we had hoped to identify a small subsample of cattle raisers who were attended by SODEPRA, the extension service for animal raising. We reasoned that if this TPT series, which was sponsored by SODEPRA, was to have any effects, it would most affect the clients of that

agency. In January we identified 39 respondents who said they were SODEPRA clients. They were in both TV and non-TV villages and so could act as experimental and control individuals for the impact of TPT. A special questionnaire was constructed for them to be applied in April.

In April 10 of the 39 persons were absent from their villages and several others could not be interviewed for other reasons. As a consequence, only 12 from TV and 12 from non-TV villages were finally interviewed. Results showed that those in TV villages did not attend TPT sessions very much at all and that their traditional view of cattle raising had not changed. Most of the cattle raisers were in the traditional Northern part of the country and were illiterate. They may well have been the most difficult type of people to try to change in any case but their indifference to a TV series meant especially for them is indicative of the problems TPT faces. Without close collaboration from field agents of the sponsoring agency or special national attention as in the Water Series, TPT programs may simply not reach or change their target audiences.

6.3. General conclusion

The exact impact of the TPT televised series is impossible to sort out for a number of reasons. First, even among TV programs TPT is not easily distinguished in the minds of rural viewers from other programs, especially those also meant for the same audience like the Ministry of Information's National Cup of Progress, or the Planning Ministry's Promovillage series, or the Ministry of Agriculture's Magazine Agricole, (all also meant for farmers.) Messages on these programs coincide and complement, though they are not ordinarily coordinated with those on similar topics produced by the Ministry of Primary and TV Education. In addition to TV programs, there are extension agents, training courses, printed materials and informal channels

of information (such as literate children bringing home new ideas from school) which impact on the lives of rural people. It is less important to sort out the exact influence of each information source than to see whether the overall result is improvement of the quality of life of rural people. Nevertheless, judging TPT on the basis of the two surveys, we can say that it has some impact on those who view in terms of retention and recall of general topic areas like agriculture and water; it also seems to help viewers recall specific pieces of advice; regarding actions TPT seems to get people to want to carry out certain activities suggested by the programs but there is little evidence that these intentions are often put into actual practice.

CHAPTER VII

PERCEPTIONS OF TPT AND PERCEIVED TPT

BENEFITS AND TPT BENEFICIARIES

7.1. Introduction

There are a number of places where audience motivation and perceptions have been previously discussed (Kaye and Lenglet, 1975, 41-42; Grant and Seya, 1976, 15-20 and Benveniste, 1976). There is evidence that though people sometimes confuse TPT with other TV programs, they do have some well-expressed feelings about the content of TPT.

In this section we will present some additional findings about peoples' attitudes concerning TPT programs. There are four sections. First, we will see how the respondents feel about the veracity of the TPT programs. Secondly we will discuss some additional responses regarding the information or training purpose of TPT programs. Thirdly, we will present some data about who the villagers perceive to be the main beneficiaries of the TPT programs and the reasons why. Here as elsewhere we must be aware of the various response biases that can influence our findings.

7.2. TPT's truthfulness

TV, and consequently TPT, is perceived by a large majority of rural people as a "truthful" medium. In 1975 (Grant and Seya) the question was asked "What you see in TPT, is it real or unreal?"[1], and the same question was repeated in the January questionnaire (Q. 75). In 1975 most village groups interviewed agreed that the TPT programs were real ("Real, because we find the same things in our village that we see on TPT.") and in January 1977, 91 percent of the TPT spectators also agreed. The follow-up question asking why people thought that the TV programs were "true" or "false" did

not produce any results which need reporting. We feel that the range of various possible attitudes toward the TPT programs is very well described in Grant and Seya (1976 : 15-21), to which the reader is referred.[2]

7.3. TPT's training purpose

In January 1977 there was some interest in the relationship between the TPT's programs and skills learning as an immediate consequence of watching TPT. This interest was fed by the growing contradiction within the TPT project between TPT's education and training purposes indicated by their name ("education extra-scolaire") and other more explicit objectives emphasizing information and sensitization (Grant, 1977). Moreover, a couple of weeks before the pre-survey three TPT programs on employment had been broadcast, which had been acclaimed by the Ivorian press as an important way to make the population aware of unemployment and the too high aspirations of formal school graduates.[3]

We asked the TPT spectators in January two questions. First, whether they thought that the TPT programs had allowed the young to learn a job (Q. 68). And secondly, those who said "no" to the first question were asked whether TPT should teach a job to the young.

Almost one-fourth of the 191 respondents to the first question did not provide an answer or said that they did not know. This probably indicates that the question was not well understood or did not make much sense. Out of the 146 remaining respondents 57 percent thought that the TPT programs had allowed the young to learn a job. Why 83 TPT spectators believe that the TPT broadcasts have taught a job is difficult to assess, especially in light of the fact that only 31 percent of them reported having seen one or more of three TPT broadcasts dealing with "jobs", mentioned in the previous paragraph.

The majority (65 percent) of those who said "No" to the first question thought it to be a task of TPT to teach job skills to the young. Thirty-six percent of those who thought so had seen one of the "job" broadcasts.

Thus, it seems that many TPT spectators are not sure whether the TPT programs have taught any specific job-related skills, but at the same time there is some desire that TPT should do this.

7.4. Perceived TPT beneficiaires

7.4.1. "Who profits from TPT?"

As we observed in the foregoing chapter and as documented elsewhere[4] there is very little empirical evidence which shows the actual benefits and the actual beneficiaries of the TPT programs. We wanted to know whether this fact was apparent in the minds of the TPT spectators, or whether they believed that there were indeed people who profit from TPT. In this section we will deal with this question

To this end we will first present the distribution of responses to the very direct question: "Who profits from TPT?" (Q. 61, January). The majority of the TPT spectators (65 percent) believes that "everybody" profits from the broadcasts. This is not surprising, given the fact that the broadcasts are called "TV for Everybody". Thus their answer is just a reflection of the program title, which is a TPT impact in itself already!

If spectators believed that benefits from out-of-school TV were accessible to a minority of people (20% did), we were interested in knowing their perceptions of who the beneficiaries were. Table 7-1 lists these perceived "minority" beneficiaries.

TABLE 7-1

Perceived "Minority" Beneficiaries of TPT*

Beneficiaries	Frequency
Spectators	14
Farmers, peasants	6
Youth	6
Villagers	5
Children	2
Those who are interested	2
Those capable of working	1
Those who have never traveled	1
Those who need information	1
Those who are strong and intelligent	1
Those who want to become more intelligent	1
Those who apply the advice given	1
Those attentive spectators	1
Those in the cooperative	1
Teachers	1
Total	44

* Number of TPT spectators who answered "only some people" for Q. 61

Since many of these categories overlap, one can constitute a composite profile of the perceived beneficiary: a young peasant who is strong, concerned and an attentive spectator of TPT. A request for justification for the particular beneficiary revealed the following types of responses: Youth: because they don't know yet what life is; they can learn about morality.

Youth: because they have the strength to apply the advice of TPT, they are not tired in the evening.

Attentive spectators: many other spectators come to chat, not to listen.

Children: because one day they will change their living condition.

Farmers: because if they conscientiously apply the advice they will earn more money.

7.4.2. Contrasting pairs of beneficiaries

We suspected that answers to the previous questions would not be extremely enlightening, so we preferred to force the respondents to make a choice between contrasting pairs of possible beneficiaries: spectators versus non-spectators, literates versus illiterates, elderly versus youth, women versus men, rich versus poor, villagers versus city dwellers, the whole village versus the individual. The forced choice was not absolute, for a respondent could choose also "both" or "don't know".

Table 7-2 presents the distribution of the choices for all the 7 dichotomies. What strikes one most is the large number of non-respondents. However, the range of percentages of non-respondents varies from 19 to 32, and this means that in some cases the alternative choice was easier or more apparent than in others and not that making forced choices was impossible. This is also indicated by the varying percentages of respondents who selected the "both" category.[5]

It appears that the TPT spectators, who dare to make a choice, believe that the young, male villagers who watch TPT are most likely to be the prime beneficiaries of the TPT programs, and that benefits they derive will accrue to the entire village rather than to the individual him- or herself. This does not mean that, in people's opinion, women or the elderly are excluded

TABLE 7-2

Forced Choice Beneficiaries of TPT*

(N = 191)

	N	%
TPT spectators	125	65
Non-TPT spectators	2	1
Both spectators and non-spectators	15	8
Don't know	3	2
No Answer	46	24
Literate people	35	18
Illiterate people	27	14
Both literates and illiterates	72	38
Don't know	5	3
No answer	52	27
Old people	10	5
Young people	68	36
Both old and young	73	38
Don't know	3	7
No answer	37	19
Women	8	4
Men	31	16
Both men and women	91	48
Don't know	8	4
No answer	53	28

Table 7-2 (Continued)

	N	%
Rich people	27	14
Poor people	33	17
Both rich and poor	65	34
Don't know	7	4
No answer	59	31
Village people	74	39
Townspeople	12	6
Both village and townspeople	49	26
Don't know	5	3
No answer	51	27
The entire village	76	40
The individual	17	9
Both the village and the individual	28	15
Don't know	8	4
No answer	62	32

* Q. 65 (January) "Who benefits more from TPT programs?"

from benefiting. Most respondents seem to agree that being literate or illiterate does not make much of a difference in terms of benefits. This is in contradiction with our other research data indicating that education is almost the only variable which is significantly and positively related to TV/TPT watching and impact.

Whenever the category "both" was chosen, the respondent was invited to elaborate on why or how TPT could benefit both parties. For the pair men-women several TPT spectators cite separate values of advice and/or information for each. While in some programs, women learn about housework, children, and infants, men receive instruction on how to farm, and how to become richer. For other pairs, too, dual beneficiaries and benefits are recognized. Says one spectator, literate people who are unemployed, and illiterates who work on the farm -- both find a message in TPT. Another spectator elaborates: the literates learn that having a job is of paramount importance; illiterates learn how to improve their plantation. The poor learn how to cultivate; the rich how to keep their money. Youth learns how to create a plantation; elders how to improve theirs. It seems that each person at his level and position can find a program addressed to his state. And this could be a correct reflection of the varied nature of the TPT programs and the intent of the Out-of-School agency. To a certain extent this is "confirmed" by the result that the highest percentage of "both" respondents is found among the "very regular" TPT spectators. Those who watch TPT almost all the time have seen programs which seem to be beneficial for all the members of the 7 pairs proposed.[6]

There is a second type of divided benefit/beneficiary. Some respondents say, for example, that the rich give the poor an example, that the spectators communicate what they see, hear and understand to non-spectators, that literates explain the program message to the illiterates, and that the elderly give advice to youth. Whether indeed such flow of communication takes place on a large scale we do not know.

A third reason why several groups might benefit is that the same TPT message could be useful for different people. An example is the following:

"When you are rich you should practice the same hygiene as the poor." And this would be a reflection of a number of TPT programs, the prescriptions of which seem to apply to almost everybody irrespective of socio-economic status. A fourth type of benefit for both elements of one pair involves a moral rather than a content-oriented message. The following comment by a spectator leads one to consider the value of TPT as a potential raiser of moral values or a stimulus to the downtrodden and the discouraged. "The rich are lazy and need to reform themselves: the poor need encouragement." The encouragement which TPT is said to offer is also expressed often when a TPT or an evaluation team visits a village. If it is sometimes mentioned that TPT pleases the villagers because it treats their problems and presents their way of life, it is invariably remarked by villagers during a site visit: "We are greatly encouraged by your showing you cared enough to leave Abidjan and travel to our faraway village to see us." A final type of divided benefit is the case of classic village solidarity: "The benefit from the youth's work goes to the elderly, for young peasants work for the old ones who are too frail." The benefits are from the labor of one party and bestowed upon the second party. And this perception seems to be confirmed by the finding that the entire village, in contrast to the individual, is the prime beneficiary.

Those TPT spectators who said that it was the "young" or "young and old" who profit most from the TPT programs were asked "Why". Their answers, categorized by the researchers are presented in Table 7-3. They speak for themselves, although it is interesting to note that among the older respondents (45 years and more) the first answer category prevailed.

TABLE 7-3

Reasons Why The Young Are Perceived as Beneficiaries of TPT*

	N	%
They have the physical work power	45	32
They like modern life	6	4
They want to go to the city	2	1
The future belongs to them	15	10
They have the physical work power and they want to go to the city	5	3
The elderly do not watch TV	5	3
The youth understands TV	6	4
Other	6	4
Don't know	2	1
No answer	49	33
Total number of TPT spectators who responded that the "youth" or the "youth and the elderly" benefitted most from TPT	141	98**

* Q. 66 (January) "Why is it that the young benefit most from TPT?"

** Due to rounding off, this is not 100.0%.

7.4.3. Rural exodus

We have seen before (Section 3.2.9.) that the rural exodus of the young is perceived as a crucial problem in most of the sample villages. Therefore we wanted to examine whether the TPT audience felt that this problem was exacerbated by TPT or whether TPT could be the basis for a solution. We asked the respondents whether, according to them, TPT helps the young to organize themselves locally, in the village, or to induce them to go to the city (Q. 67, January). We are aware of the almost implicit answer which is included in the question's formulation itself. Therefore the responses should be regarded with caution. Three-fourths of the TPT spectators thought that TPT helps the young to organize themselves locally. Only 5 percent thought that the TPT programs induces the young to go to the city. Fourteen percent of the 194 TPT spectators did not give an answer, but we do not know for what reason. If these responses are a true reflection of the spectators' opinions about the TPT programs it means that there is a large TPT goodwill among, at least, the TPT audience. This goodwill coupled to the image of truthfulness the TPT programs carry, means that TPT might be a potentially effective means in the struggle against the rural exodus. Thus we see that according to many TPT spectators the young profit most from watching TPT and that one of the benefits is the help they receive to organize themselves locally instead of going to the city. This does not exclude the possibility that the general TV programs, and even the TPT programs, exert a counter-influence in showing the "attractiveness" of the city. This is discussed in the next section.

7.5. Perceived TPT benefits

7.5.1. Urban effect

In this section we will deal with two "benefits" or "effects" as perceived by the TPT spectators. It is almost a universal observation that television is an urban phenomenon. Thus the introduction of television in the rural areas of the Ivory Coast could have a "negative" effect in that it shows urban models of behavior which are not conducive to a "proper" transformation of the rural areas. We examined this effect by means of Questions 70 and 71 in the pre-questionnaire.

It has also been argued that if TV or TPT programs are to be accepted by the village audience and are to have a beneficial influence on changing village life, they should be relevant to the realities of the villagers. This issue was probed through a number of questions in the January and April questionnaires dealing with village problems and the question whether village problems were treated by TPT.

One of the objectives of the ETV experiment in the Ivory Coast, for school pupils as well as for adults, is to stem the rural exodus. Does the TV present ideas and innovations which tend to glorify city life, or does it reinforce the value of rural life? Two different TV programs, for example, the evening news and the TPT program, may reinforce contradictory models. Is TPT, inasmuch as spectators are able to distinguish its programs from the general TV programs, perceived as favoring or suggesting a model of urban living? The question, "Does TPT teach you to live like city people?" elicited the responses shown in Table 7-4. Two things are surprising in these results. First, the massive agreement with the "urban effect" of the TPT program seems to contrast with the 75 percent of the TPT audience which said that the TPT programs helped the young to organize themselves locally, in the village (Section 7.4.). The second surprise is that we expected that most of the responses would be in the "yes and no" category, because in fact TPT programs for rural

TABLE 7-4

The "Urban" Influence of TPT*

	N	%
No	37	19
Yes	122	64
Yes and no	1	1
Don't know	18	9
No answer	13	9
Total number of TPT spectators	191	100

* Q. 70 (January) "Does TPT teach you to live like city people?"

as well as urban audiences have been broadcast in the past, addressing life conditions in both situations. But here we find only one respondent who says "yes and no". Both "surprises" become more understandable when reviewing responses to the follow-up question: "How does or does not TPT teach you to live like city people?"

The 122 "positive" respondents advanced 143 reasons why they thought that TPT taught them to live like city people. We have grouped these reasons in four main categories:

(1) city living associated with TPT lessons

(2) city living as a model of attractive living

(3) city living associated with material benefits

(4) city living associated with wealth.

7.5.1.1. City living associated with TPT lessons

The 16 reasons which fall into this category are listed in Table 7-5.

TABLE 7-5

Aspects of City Living Associated With TPT Lessons

	Number of respondents
Filter water	8
Save money	2
Open bank account	1
Care for babies	1
Avoid diseases	1
Get a job	1
Empty garbage into trash cans	1
Clean up around the house	1
Total	16

The first comment one can make about this list is that the respondents seem to want to slip into their answers (as into some others) the proof that they have been attentive to TPT broadcasts. It is not the kind of response expected. Secondly, it is either implicitly or explicitly understood that these pieces of advice are followed in the city. One should filter water in the village "because all city dwellers filter their water." Thus, there seems to be a sense that the "urban" behavior suggested over television should be followed by everyone. This can also be noted in the next category.

7.5.1.2. City living as a model of attractive living

The 59 reasons listed in Table 7-6 reveal feelings of envy as the have-not villagers are struck by images of how the "haves" live. The images brought to mind are not necessarily those of TPT but of TV programs in general ("Stores," "meetings"). There is an acceptance that what they see is good and should be copied; that is what the villagers are presently doing is "wrong".

TABLE 7-6

Aspects of City Living as a Model of Attractive Living

	Number of respondents
Hygiene, cleanliness	32
Imitate city people	16
See Abidjan	2
What is modern is good	2
Good health	2
Good manners	2
Good mentality	1
See stores	1
See big meetings	1
Total	59

The most popular response concerns hygiene and cleanliness. These general terms refer in the specific responses first to personal hygiene, then to cleanliness of one's house and courtyard, and thirdly to drinking clean water. The predominant aspiration seems to be one of good health, and secondarily of good appearance.

7.5.1.3. City living associated with material benefits

The 43 reasons of Table 7-7 refer in particular to specific material benefits rather than to a generally better state as in Table 7-6. The most popular item, modern housing, could also have been included in Table 7-5, for in 1976 there was a series of TV programs on rural housing[7]. The references to good dress must be skewed, for twelve out of seventeen responses emanate from one village, where the researcher seems to have systematically

TABLE 7-7

Aspects of City Living Associated with Material Benefits

	Number of respondents
Modern housing	21
Good clothes	17
Good eating	2
Vehicles	2
Furniture	1
Total	43

imposed the answer:[8] mention elsewhere of good clothes is shared among several villages. In all references to material benefits, one is especially conscious of the aspiration inherent in TPT participation: to be better off like city people. Table 7-8 will accentuate this underlying theme.

7.5.1.4. City living associated with wealth

"People who live in the city have more! Because of their wealth they enjoy better living conditions. Peasants can get richer too, but only through hard work". Such is the reasoning which lies behind this list of comments presented in Table 7-8. While the previous three categories (TPT advice, material benefits, model behavior) can be subsumed in the present one, it becomes clearer why people think that TPT teaches villagers to live like city dwellers. To some this question meant whether TPT tells one how to work hard to earn more money: one spectator summed up his answer: "Yes, TPT teaches me how to live in luxury, because of the wealth of the city people." Spectators do not expect the wealth to come from the outside, to be inherited, or to involve city-type labor. One villager put it this way: "We cultivate

TABLE 7-8

Aspects of City Living Associated with Wealth

	Number of respondents
Work well to earn money	9
Money	6
Work well	5
Better living conditions	5
Total	25

cotton, coffee, and eggplant to try to earn money, as in the city." "..... as in the city" refersto money, not the means of its acquisition.

Most spectators who said that TPT does not teach one how to live like city dwellers either evoked the money or wealth differences between city dwellers and rural people or they felt that TPT was more rural than urban oriented. Some comments on the financial distribution were: "we aren't paid by the month the way they are in the city" or "we can't have what the city dwellers have" or "we villagers don't have the same means."

Ten percent of the spectators considered TPT basically a program for rural farmers. One clarified his point of view in the following manner: "In TPT we see people working in the fields. In the city they work in offices." Another went further than noting the difference; he declared his affiliation to rural life. "As far as I'm concerned, I have no intention of moving to the city. What I see on TV helps me in my small village life. The other things don't interest me." This indicates that he was aware of the other (urban?) TV messages. A third believed that TPT was designed mostly for the farmer. ".....However, if we have business in the city, such as applying for an ID card, TPT tells us how to do it." (The respondent is

referring to a program on establishing ID cards and other legal documents broadcast in 1975.)

7.5.2. Urban versus rural effect

Now returning to the two "surprises" mentioned in the first paragraphs of this Section (7.5.), we find that the contrasting perceptions of a simultaneous rural and urban effect is not so contradictory as it first seemed: First, the responses to questions 67 and 70-71 are in line with the implied direction of the questions' wording. Apparently the respondents preferred to give a reply they thought was expected. Secondly, the contrasting perceptions are a fair reflection of the contrasting and sometimes even opposite implicit and explicit message of the TPT programs themselves: on the one hand TPT programs propose the improvement of rural living conditions during a maximum of one hour per week. On the other hand during the "remaining" 35 hours of TV programming the TV screen is saturated with "urban" messages in the form of newscasts, serials, documentaries, etc.[9] And there is evidence, for example, in Sections 4.2. and 5.3.6. and in Seya and Yao (1977) that the villagers are also exposed - though probably to a limited degree - to these general RTI programs. Third, there is the very plausible explanation that the TPT viewers do not think that living like city people means one has to move to the city - perhaps even the opposite. If in the mind of the spectators "modern living" is equated with "city living", modernizing their own living conditions automatically means following the urban model.

7.5.3. Village problems and TPT programs

In order to obtain a better idea to what extent the TPT programs were relevant to the villagers we asked in the pre- and post-questionnaires whether and what kind of problems existed in the villages and whether these problems were dealt with by the TPT programs.

In Section 3.2.6.. in the context of the main development problems of the 22 sample villages we distinguished already four categories of responses to Question 42 (April), each containing 25 percent of the 161 answers[10]: (1) problems related to water (potable water, wells and drainage), (2) problems related to health (construction of a dispensary), (3) problems related to housing (stone house construction and rezoning), and (4) a diversity of problems concerning lack of money, lack of land, village accessibility, etc. For a complete list the reader is referred to Appendix J.

When we asked the respondents whether the main problem they had mentioned was "treated" on TV (Question 43, April) 53 percent of them said "yes" and 31 percent said "no". Three percent "didn't know" and 13 percent did not give an answer. This could be considered an indication that for at least half of the TV/TPT audience, the programs have some relevance. In January we asked first whether TPT dealt with any village problem (Question 77), and if so, what these problems were. In April the order was reversed: first we asked what the village problems were and next whether they were dealt with on TV. The response distribution to the January "whether" question was almost identical to the distribution of the April "whether" question: Seven percent remained without a response, 8 percent "didn't know", 53 percent said "yes" and 31 percent of the TPT spectators said "no". When asking what the village problems were (Question 70, January) we obtained the responses listed in Table 7-9. We feel that this list is an immediate reflection of the nature and number of TPT programs broadcast in the period 1974-1976. Also because almost all TPT spectators mention a problem covered by the TPT programs, we can conclude that many TPT programs were relevant for the spectators. Whether non-spectators do not watch TV because the programs are <u>not</u> relevant to their needs, we do not know.

TABLE 7-9

Village Problems Dealth With by TPT According to January TPT Spectators

	N	%
Agriculture (including cooperatives and livestock raising	54	29
Water (including water filters and well construction)	53	20
Housing	26	14
Health and hygiene (including latrine construction)	23	12
Savings and budgeting	16	9
Rural exodus	11	6
Jobs	1	1
School	1	1
Total	185	100

In order to probe somewhat further we asked, in April, whether there were other crucial village problems which had not been covered by the TV/TPT programs (Question 44), and if so, what problems these were (Question 45). In the responses we again observe a large non-response category (17 percent), which, of course, affects the interpretation of the results. Of the 151 persons who gave an answer 57 percent said "yes" and 33 percent said "no". The different problems that have not been treated by TV/TPT are summarized in Table 7-10. The first left-hand column shows the number of individual respondents mentioning the problem. The right-hand column classifies the responses by the number of villages in which it was mentioned. When comparing Tables 7-9 and 7-10 it can readily be observed that there is indeed a

TABLE 7-10

Village Problems Not Shown on Television

According to April TV Spectators

	Number of individual responses	Number of villages
No electricity	8	5
Neither medical center nor maternity	8	5
No market	7	4
No water	6	3
No school	5	2
No "Sub-Prefect"	5	3
No road	5	4
No rezoning	5	3
No well	3	3
No land	2	2
Village in bad shape	2	2
No house for teacher	2	1
Rural exodus	1	1
Animal disease	1	1
No income earning job	1	1
No SODERIZ office	1	1
No teacher	1	1
Problem of the succession of the village's chief	1	1
No TPT programs in the local language	1	1
Total	65	44*

* The total of 44 villages in which a "non-treated" problem was mentioned, that is an average of 2.75 problems per TV village were mentioned.

contrast between the problems which are covered by TPT (January) and the problems which are not covered (April). However, the "village problems" in Table 7-10 do not seem to be as appropriate or adapted a subject for a TV program as the problems of Table 7-9.

Thus, from the foregoing evidence it can be concluded that although more than half of the TPT or TV spectators agree that important village problems are being presented and discussed in the TPT/TV programs, there are a large number of problems whose solution does not lie in the "sensitization" or "information" approach of TPT. For many village problems other inputs and socio-economic changes are required in order to solve them. TPT or TV programs could contribute to a general awareness of these problems, and have probably done so especially during the two Water Series, but the real solutions must be found in increasing individual purchase power, in fundamental changes of the socio-economic structure, in massive improvements in the social and material infrastructure of the rural areas, in short, in a fundamental re-direction of state development policies.

REFERENCES

1. The original French question is: "Ce que TPT dit, c'est vrai ou faux?" The word "vrai" not only means "real" but also "truthful". Thus, the question asks about "reality" as well as "truthfulness".
2. See also Seya and Yao, 1977 : 33.
3. Twenty-nine percent of the January TPT spectators reported that they had seen at least one of these programs (Q. 54). The three programs were: "No Jobs" (11/17/76), "I want to be a worker" (11/24/76), and "There is no dumb job" (12/1/77).
4. Lenglet, 1975; Grant and Seya, 1976; Seya and Yao, 1977.
5. There is an evident lack of reliability visible in the questionnaires administered by different researchers. In the instance of one ACRI not one of the respondents replied "both", and in the case of another ACRI nearly everyone answered "both"; we conclude that the researcher has biased the answer by the way he oriented the respondent during this part of the questionnaire. See Section 2.3.1. about the research performance of the ACRIs.
6. Crosstabulations between the choice of beneficiaries as dependent variables and sex, age, education, ethnic affiliation, religion, as independent variables did not produce significant results. We did not find that any of the independent variables made a difference in what forced choice was made.
7. Seya and Yao, 1977, part Two.
8. Of course it could be that there was a particular historical reason in this village.
9. Based on a sample of 5 weeks in 1976 we estimated the average number of TV broadcasting hours per week to be 36 hours and 40 minutes.

10. Here we exclude the 2 respondents who "did not know" and the 20 non-respondents which constituted 12 percent of all the 183 April TV spectators.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

What conclusion can be drawn from the research findings presented in the foregoing chapters? The principal conclusion is that the Ivorian Out-of-School Educational television project works, though minimally and inefficiently. It also has the potential to ameliorate its operations: the reach of the TPT programs could be increased in part through improving their form and their reception.

8.1. Conclusions

Before making specific recommendations we should keep in mind two main findings:

1. The TPT programs reach only a small segment of the rural adult population. Although the TPT audience is very small, it is difficult to grasp in one or two static pictures its characteristics for two reasons: first, the audience is fluid and not really organized into a core of regular viewers; second, it is composed of different socio-economic groups which come to watch TPT with various individual motivations. And it is not exaggerating to say that a large part of the TPT audience is not directly interested in the TPT sessions per se but rather in the TV programs. One can see "TV for everybody" as really everybody's TV.

2. When comparing the TPT attendance data reported by the school directors with national attendance estimates (Fritz, 1976 and Lenglet and McAnany, 1977) we can make the additional conclusion that the effective participation in the beginning of 1977 has never been so low since the regular TPT broadcasts began in October 1974. These findings suggest that the OSTV system is presently in a difficult situation. However, most of the problems have existed since the beginning of TPT programs and have been sufficiently

explained in the previous reports. Our purpose in these final pages is not again to give an exhaustive list of obstacles to the efficiency of OSTV but to emphasize some contradictions in the OSTV system, in its adult educational methods and in the objectives of its programs.

First there are two conceptions of adult rural education underlying the OSTV project which are, as the practice shows, irreconciliable: rural animation and formal education. On the one hand, OSTV has the characteristics of rural animation when it stresses the village or the farm as the site of instruction and action, the animator who should serve as a catalyst of village development, the technical vocabulary or know-how, the peasant's world, its activities, its difficulties as a frame of reference. On the other hand, OSTV has in fact the characteristics of traditional formal education when we observe in the OSTV practice the importance of the school which is traditionally a place of talk rather than action, the use of Primary School Teachers as animators, the use of traditional transmission of knowledge, the central government and national development plans as a frame of reference.

The ambiguity of the OSTV project is also revealed in the TPT messages where most of the time a search for adaptive solutions is made "in the perspective of integration into the modern world without rupture with certain traditional values".*

Concerning this point, we would like to emphasize another important finding, the lack of action undertaken as a result of TPT viewing. The different socio-economic groups who compose the TPT audience have something in common: the general lack of means which prevents most of the peasants

---

*Quotes from 1976 OSTV documents dealing with TPT objectives.

from undertaking most actions. Therefore it is not surprising to find that the impact of TPT is minimal in terms of actions for village development, in spite of peasants' desire for better living conditions. But at the same time, rural spectators are not interested in actions which neither generate cash income nor result in a gain of prestige for them as we found in the case of health programs. In contrast, it can be stated that the TPT programs attain their sensitization objectives in terms of retention of TPT themes and advice when they deal with the issues that people feel are crucial for them, agricultural production, clean water, better housing, etc.

TPT educational methods and the form of most TPT messages underline that action is not the prime concern of Out-of-School education. In the documents of the OSTV it becomes evident that the objective of action ("working groups", "collective action") progressively lost support and was abandoned in 1977. In contrast our findings show that the TPT system could be an effective propaganda instrument in the rural areas for sensitizing peasants to central government policies.

8.2. Recommendations

The recommendations presented here are deduced from the survey reported here. They suggest that the OSTV, being aware of its possibilities and limitations, reorganize its programming and increase the interest for and the credibility of TPT.

(A) Reorganization of TPT programming

Recommendation 1: Programs should be broadcast on time. Moreover, there should be strict observance of the program schedule.

Recommendation 2: A more efficient use of TPT films should be obtained by rebroadcasting TPT programs which were popular among the rural

audience. This desire was expressed by many peasants who had heard about and/or seen broadcasts such as Waribana, a program in the credit and saving series. The reruns should be announced well in advance.

Recommendation 3: TPT programs should be presented as a longer series in order to draw people's attention to a problem examined from different perspectives. A good example was the Water Series.

Recommendation 4: More TPT programs should have a dramatic form. This appears to have a greater effect than purely educational or technical telecasts. We encourage the Out-of-School Education Department to continue producing series such as SIKATIO, a dramatization about the problems of the rural exodus and urban life.

Recommendation 5: In the programs the local language or an African French as opposed to a metropolitan French should be used whenever possible, in order to stimulate interest and to improve the efficiency of communication. For instance, Sénoufo was used in a recent series on cattle breeding. Efforts in this direction should be continued.

(B) Increasing interest in TPT

Recommendation 6: A national information campaign should be launched to re-affirm TPT's sensitization objective, and to renew the population's interest. Radio would be a good means of diffusion for such a campaign. It would also prove useful to gain the support of the local officials (village chiefs and PDCI secretaries). We cannot stress enough the necessity of the chiefs' backing if TPT is to have success in the villages. Both modern and traditional channels should have complementary roles.

Recommendation 7: Weekly radio announcements could inform villagers of coming programs. Of course, this would require the regular broadcast of the announced TPT programs.

We consider these recommendations to be minimal ones - requiring essentially organizational changes. We should not forget, however, that if TPT is really to be an effective catalyst for village development, essential improvements must be made concerning the animation itself and the coordination between the different cooperating agencies.

(C) Reorganization of reception structure

Recommendation 8: The teacher-animators must be paid in order to increase their willingness to organize the listening groups.

Recommendation 9: The animators must have specific training to lead group discussions for adults.

Recommendation 10: The animators should receive on time the support documents for the scheduled TPT programs and should be notified in advance about programming changes.

Recommendation 11: Institutional channels must be created to coordinate the actions of TPT animators and the field agents of the organizations sponsoring the TPT programs.

As one can see, our recommendations apply essentially to the rural TPT audience. Only if the last three recommendations can be carried off, will the listening groups have a chance of being transformed into groups for action. In this chapter, we have considered as a given fact that the viewing of TPT programs will remain within the school setting and that the Primary School teachers will continue to be the only ones available as TPT animators.

APPENDIX A

Nom de l'enquêteur .....

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRE JANUARY 1977

I. IDENTITE DE L'ENQUETE

1. Village .....
2. Sous-préfecture .....
3. Nom du quartier .....
4. Nom du chef du quartier .....
5. Nom du chef de cour .....
6. Nom et prénom de l'enquêté .....
7. Sexe
   ( ) homme
   ( ) femme
8. Age
   ( ) de 15 à 25 ans
   ( ) de 26 à 45 ans
   ( ) plus de 45 ans
9. Ethnie .....
10. Religion
   ( ) animiste/fétichiste
   ( ) Musulman
   ( ) Chrétien
   ( ) autre: laquelle? .....
11. Statut
   ( ) Chef (de .....)
   ( ) Président de l'association de parents d'élèves
   ( ) Président ou membre de comité PDCI
   ( ) animateur de terrain, agent de société d'état
   ( ) citoyen ordinaire
   ( ) autre: lequel? .....
12. Club ou association
   Membre d'un(e)
   ( ) club sportif
   ( ) club culturel, théâtre

13. Activité professionnelle principale

( ) planteur
( ) cultivateur
( ) ménagère
( ) manoeuvre, ouvrier, chauffeur
( ) fonctionnaire
( ) transporteur
( ) artisan
( ) commerçant
( ) sans emploi

14. Production agricole

produit (café, cacao, riz, coton, igname, etc.)	nombre de sacs ou nombre de tonnes	
_____	_____	
_____	_____	
_____	_____	
(café)	(14 sacs)	(EXEMPLE)

15. Autre type de revenu

Quoi? .....

Combien? .....

16. Revenu annuel total

( ) sans revenu
( ) 0 à 50 000 F
( ) 51 000 à 75 000 F
( ) 76 000 à 100 000 F
( ) 101 000 à 200 000 F
( ) 201 000 à 500 000 F
( ) 501 000 à 1 000 000 F
( ) plus de 1 000 000 F

17. Est-ce que l'enquêté comprend le français? ( ) non ( ) oui

18. Est-ce que l'enquêté parle le français? ( ) non

19. Instruction

( ) analphabète
( ) en dessous de CM2
( ) CM2
( ) C.E.P.E.
( ) 6ème, 5ème, ou 4ème
( ) B.E.P.C.
( ) au delà

II. VACCINATION

20. Avez-vous déjà été vacciné par l'équipe des Grandes Endémies? ( ) non ( ) oui

(SI NON, POSEZ LA QUESTION 22)

21. SI OUI, contre quelles maladies?
( ) variole
( ) rougeole
( ) choléra
( ) fièvre jaune
( ) autre .....
( ) ne sais pas

22. Est-ce que la vaccination sert à prévenir la maladie ou à guérir la maladie?
( ) prévenir la maladie
( ) guérir la maladie
( ) ne sais pas

23. Celui qui a été vacciné contre la variole, est-il protegé contre cette maladie pour toujours ou pour quelques années seulement?
( ) pour toujours
( ) pour quelques années
( ) ne sais pas

24. Que se passe-t-il dans votre corps quand vous avez été vacciné? .....
.....
.....

25. Etes-vous d'accord pour faire vacciner vos enfants? ( ) non ( ) oui

26. SI NON, pourquoi?

( ) la vaccination est dangereuse
( ) la vaccination ne sert à rien
( ) la vaccination rend malade
( ) nous avons nos propres moyens pour combattre la maladie
( ) autre .....

27. SI OUI, pourquoi?

( ) la vaccination est bonne
( ) la vaccination protège contre les maladies
( ) après la vaccination on ne peut plus contracter la maladie contre laquelle on a été vacciné
( ) autre .....

28. Lorsque l'équipe de santé est passée dans votre village, avez-vous fait vacciner vos enfants?

( ) non
( ) oui

29. SI NON, pourquoi?

( ) la vaccination est dangereuse
( ) la vaccination ne sert à rien
( ) la vaccination rend malade
( ) nous avons nos propres moyens pour combattre la maladie
( ) autre .....

III. ELEVAGE

30. Est-ce que vous avez des animaux (poulets, cabris, moutons, boeufs, etc.)?

( ) non
( ) oui

(SI NON, POSEZ LA QUESTION 34)

31. SI OUI, combien d'animaux avez-vous?

	nombre
( )	poulets
( )	pintades
( )	dindons
( )	cabris
( )	moutons
( )	porcs
( )	boeufs
( )	autre .....

Etes-vous encadré par un agent de la SODERIZ

(SI NON, POSEZ LA QUESTION 34)

33. SI OUI, combien de fois voyez-vous l'agent de la SODEPRA?

( ) une fois par semaine
( ) une fois tous les 15 jours
( ) une fois par mois
( ) une fois par trimestre
( ) autre .....

34. A votre avis, pourquoi le gouvernement conseille-t-il aux Ivoiriens de pratiquer l'élevage?

( ) pour gagner de l'argent
( ) pour avoir suffisament de viande
( ) pour limiter les importations en viande
( ) pour promouvoir le développement économique et social
( ) autre .....
( ) ne sais pas

35. Pour l'élevage moderne des boeufs, des moutons, et des cabris, il faut s'adonner à plusieurs travaux: quels sont ces travaux?

( ) parcage
( ) vaccination
( ) déparasitage
( ) choisir les pâturages non loin des points d'eau
( ) rotation des pâturages
( ) faire sortir les animaux et les conduire au pâturage
( ) les faire manger outre l'herbe, des sous-produits agricoles ou des déchets ménagers
( ) autre .....
( ) ne sais pas

36. Que faut-il faire pour avoir un animal en bonne santé?

( ) le déparasiter
( ) le faire vacciner
( ) lui donner de la nourriture diversifiée
( ) garder le lait des vaches pour les veaux
( ) autre .....
( ) ne sais pas

37. Pourquoi faut-il parquer les animaux?

( ) éviter la divagation
( ) éviter les palabres
( ) pour pouvoir les compter
( ) éviter la contagion de certaines maladies
( ) autre .....
( ) ne sais pas

38. Quels sont les avantages de l'élevage moderne? .....
.....
.....

39. Quels sont les inconvénients de l'élevage moderne? .....
.....
.....

(QUESTION 40 S'APPLIQUE SEULEMENT AUX ENQUETES QUI ONT DES ANIMAUX)

40. A propos de vos animaux, pouvez-vous nous dire .....

( ) non
( ) oui — si vous parquez vos animaux

( ) non
( ) oui — si vous les faites vacciner

( ) non
( ) oui — si vous les faites déparasiter

( ) non
( ) oui — si vous leur donner à manger des déchets ménagers et/ou des sous-produits agricoles

( ) non
( ) oui — si vous faites conduire le troupeau
( ) non applicable

IV. TELEVISION

41. Suivez-vous les émissions à la télévision? ( ) non
( ) oui

42. SI NON, pourquoi? .....
.....

(FIN DU QUESTIONNAIRE POUR CEUX QUI ONT REPONDU NON A LA QUESTION 41)

43. SI OUI, est-ce que vous suivez les émissions très souvent, de temps en temps, ou presque jamais?

( ) très souvent
( ) de temps en temps
( ) presque jamais

44. Où suivez-vous les émissions télévisuelles? ( ) à l'école
( ) chez vous
( ) chez quelqu'un d'autre

45. Quelles sortes d'émissions regardez-vous?

( ) "Midi Magazine"
( ) "Télé Actualité"
( ) "Nouvelles du pays"
( ) émission religieuse
( ) variétés locales ("au village ce soir," "mensonge d'un soir")
( ) variétés internationales
( ) feuilleton ("le Saint," "Kojak," "Colombo," "Hawaii-Five-O," "Maya")
( ) sport (balon, catch, boxe, "sport panorama")
( ) "Télé pour Tous"
( ) "Comment ça va?"
( ) "Cuisine pour Tous"
( ) "Fauteuil blanc"
( ) "Témoins de notre temps"
( ) cinéma (longs métrages)
( ) documentaires ("les grandes batailles du passé," "America," etc.)
( ) autre .....

46. Quelles autres émissions aimeriez-vous regarder? .....
.....

47. A quoi sert la télévision?

( ) à distraire
( ) à instruire les enfants
( ) à instruire (en général)
( ) à instruire et à distraire
( ) à autre chose .....
( ) ne sais pas

48. Quels jours suivez-vous les émissions télévisuelles?

( ) lundi
( ) mardi
( ) mercredi
( ) jeudi
( ) vendredi
( ) samedi
( ) dimanche
( ) selon l'évènement (match, etc.)

49. Savez-vous que le mercredi et le vendredi à partir de 20 H 15 la télévision de l'école présente des émissions appelées TELE POUR TOUS suivies de discussion spécialement pour vous, villageois?

( ) non
( ) oui

(SI NON, DITES-LE-LUI ET POURSUIVRE L'ENQUETE)

50. SI OUI, assistez-vous à ces émissions, TELE POUR TOUS, maintenant?

( ) non
( ) oui

51. SI NON, est-ce que vous y avez assisté auparavant?

( ) non
( ) oui

(SI LE SUJET REPOND OUI A LA QUESTION 50, POSEZ-LUI LA QUESTION SUIVANTE)

52. Combien de fois par mois assistez-vous à ces émissions, TELE POUR TOUS?

( ) 1 fois par mois
( ) 2 fois par mois
( ) 3 - 4 fois par mois
( ) chaque fois qu'elles ont lieu
( ) autre .....

53. Pourquoi n'assistez-vous pas (plus) aux émissions, TELE POUR TOUS?

( ) je n'ai pas le temps
( ) je suis fatigué du travail de la journée
( ) je ne comprends pas le français
( ) c'est du barratin
( ) c'est de la sorcellerie
( ) la télévision pervertit les moeurs
( ) l'école c'est le domaine des enfants
( ) c'est pour les jeunes
( ) c'est pour les hommes
( ) c'est pour les citadins
( ) c'est pour ceux qui n'ont rien à faire
( ) c'est une perte de temps
( ) mon mari ne m'y autorise pas
( ) je n'aime pas les questions que pose l'animateur après l'émission
( ) l'animateur nous empêche de suivre les émissions suivantes à la télévision
( ) j'ai des problèmes avec l'animateur
( ) il y a tout le temps des palabres
( ) la télévision n'apprend pas à parler le français
( ) j'aurais voulu que ce soit en dialecte: quel dialecte? .....
( ) de toute façon par manque de moyens je ne pourrais pas pratiquer les conseils
( ) l'horaire ne me convient pas
( ) les jours mercredi et vendredi ne me conviennent pas
( ) autre .....
( ) ne sais pas

(SI LE SUJET N'ASSISTE PAS DU TOUT AUX EMISSIONS TELE POUR TOUS,
C'EST LA FIN DU QUESTIONNAIRE)

54. De quoi parlent les émissions TELE POUR TOUS que vous avez vues?

( ) agriculture (coopératives, CIOT, café)
( ) problèmes de l'eau, filtres, etc.
( ) prévoir les dépenses, épargne, "Koutou Kouakou"
( ) habitat
( ) santé, hygiène, nutrition
( ) métiers, travail
( ) autre .....
( ) autre .....

55. Savez-vous d'avance le sujet de chaque émission de TELE POUR TOUS? ( ) non

56. SI OUI, comment? ( ) par un élève
( ) par un maître
( ) par une autorité du village
( ) par la radio
( ) autre .....

57. Immédiatement après les émissions TELE POUR TOUS, l'animateur engage des discussions. Est-ce qu'elles vous intéressent en général?
( ) non
( ) oui

58. SI NON, pourquoi?
( ) je n'y suis pas habitué
( ) elles font perdre du temps
( ) elles nous empêchent de voir les émissions suivantes à la télévision
( ) je ne peux pas contester ce que la télévision ou l'animateur m'enseigne
( ) parce que .....

59. SI OUI, pourquoi?
( ) parce qu'elles précisent certaines notions
( ) parce qu'elles nous donnent l'occasion de prendre la parole
( ) parce que .....

60. Prenez-vous la parole pendant ces discussions très souvent, quelquefois, ou jamais?
( ) très souvent
( ) quelquefois
( ) jamais

I. BENEFICES

61. A qui est-ce que TELE POUR TOUS profite? ( ) à tout le monde
( ) à quelques-uns seulement
( ) à vous-même
( ) à personne

(SI LA REPONSE EST "à quelques-uns seulement,"
POSEZ LES DEUX QUESTIONS SUIVANTES)

62. A qui précisément? .....

63. Pourquoi à eux? .....
.....

(QUESTION 64: IL EST NECESSAIRE D'AMENER LE SUJET A CHOISIR UNE DES 4 POSSIBILITES POUR CHAQUE LIGNE)

64. TELE POUR TOUS profite surtout à qui?

( ) spectateurs	( ) non spectateurs	( ) les deux	( ) ne sais pas
( ) lettrés	( ) illettrés	( ) les deux	( ) ne sais pas
( ) vieux	( ) jeunes	( ) les deux	( ) ne sais pas
( ) femmes	( ) hommes	( ) les deux	( ) ne sais pas
( ) riches	( ) pauvres	( ) les deux	( ) ne sais pas
( ) villageois	( ) citadins	( ) les deux	( ) ne sais pas
( ) tout le village	( ) individu	( ) les deux	( ) ne sais pas

(REGARDEZ LE NOMBRE DE FOIS QUE LE SUJET A REPONDU "les deux." POUR CHAQUE FOIS, POSEZ LA QUESTION AU SUJET: "Comment justifiez-vous que TELE POUR TOUS profite aux deux?")

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

(SI POUR LE SUJET CE SONT LES JEUNES QUI PROFITENT DE TELE POUR TOUS, POSEZ LA QUESTION 66)

66. Pourquoi est-ce que ce sont les jeunes qui profitent de TELE POUR TOUS?
( ) parce qu'ils ont la force physique pour faire des travaux
( ) parce qu'ils aiment la vie moderne
( ) parce que les jeunes ont envie d'aller en ville
( ) parce que l'avenir est à eux
( ) autre .....

67. A votre avis, TELE POUR TOUS amène plutôt les jeunes à s'organiser sur place au village, ou à aller en ville

68. Jusqu'à maintenant, est-ce que TELE POUR TOUS a permis aux jeunes d'apprendre un métier?

( ) non
( ) oui
( ) ne sais pas

(SI LA REPONSE EST NON, POSEZ LA QUESTION 69)

69. Est-ce que TELE POUR TOUS devrait apprendre aux jeunes un métier?

( ) non
( ) oui
( ) ne sais pas

70. Est-ce que TELE POUR TOUS apprend à vivre comme les gens de la ville?

( ) non
( ) oui
( ) ne sais pas

(SI LE SUJET REPOND "oui" OU "non," FAITES EXPLIQUER COMMENT)

71. Comment? .....
.....

72. Pensez-vous que les conseils donnés à TELE POUR TOUS vous ont aidé dans une action?

( ) non
( ) oui

73. SI OUI, quelle est cette action? .....
.....

74. A votre avis, qui fait TELE POUR TOUS?

( ) le gouvernement
( ) les blancs
( ) les maîtres (Education Nationale)
( ) autre .....
( ) ne sais pas

75. Ce que vous voyez à TELE POUR TOUS, est-ce que c'est vrai ou est-ce que c'est faux?

( ) c'est faux
( ) c'est vrai

76. Pourquoi? .....
.....

77. Est-ce que les mêmes problèmes qui existent dans votre village ont été abordés dans une émission TELE POUR TOUS?

( ) non
( ) oui
( ) ne sais pas

(SI LA REPONSE EST "oui," POSEZ LA QUESTION 78)

78. Quels sont ces problèmes? .....
.....

79. Citez quelques conseils donnés par TELE POUR TOUS: .....
.....
.....

80. Est-ce que vous avez vous-même appliqué un de ces conseils?

( ) non
( ) oui

81. SI NON, pourquoi? .....
.....

82. SI OUI, lequel? .....

83. Pourquoi? .....

(FIN DU QUESTIONNAIRE)

POUR LES VILLAGES SANS LA TELE A.

TELEVISION

1. Avez-vous entendu parler de la télévision? ( ) non
( ) oui

(SI LA REPONSE EST "non," LE QUESTIONNAIRE EST FINI)

2. SI OUI, suivez-vous les émissions à la télévision? ( ) non
( ) oui

(SI NON, POSEZ LA QUESTION 8)

3. SI OUI, regardez-vous les émissions à la télévision très souvent, de temps en temps, ou presque jamais?
( ) très souvent
( ) de temps en temps
( ) presque jamais

4. Où suivez-vous les émissions à la télévision?
( ) dans le village voisin
( ) en ville

5. Quels jours suivez-vous les émissions télévisuelles?
( ) lundi
( ) mardi
( ) mercredi
( ) jeudi
( ) vendredi
( ) samedi
( ) dimanche
( ) selon l'évènement (match, etc.)

6. Quelles sortes d'émissions regardoz-vous?

( ) "Midi Magazine"
( ) "Télé Actualité"
( ) "Nouvelles du pays"
( ) émission religieuse
( ) variétés locales ("au village ce soir," "mensonge d'un soir," etc.)
( ) variétés internationales
( ) feuilleton ("le Saint," "Kojak," "Colombo," "Hawaii-Five-O," "Maya," etc.)
( ) sport (balon, catch, boxe, "sport panorama," etc.)
( ) "Télé pour Tous"
( ) "Comment ça va?"
( ) "Cuisine pour Tous"
( ) "Fauteuil blanc"
( ) "Témoins de notre temps"
( ) cinéma (longs métrages)
( ) documentaires ("les grandes batailles du passé," "America," etc.)
( ) autre .....

7. Quelles autres émissions aimeriez-vous regarder? .....
.....
.....

8. A quoi sert la télévision?
( ) à distraire
( ) à instruire les enfants
( ) à instruire (en général)
( ) à instruire et à distraire
( ) à autre chose .....
( ) ne sais pas

(FIN DU QUESTIONNAIRE)

VISTERE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT PRIMAIRE
ET DE LA TELEVISION EDUCATIVE

SERVICE D'EVALUATION

APPENDIX B

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRE APRIL 1977

Nom de l'enquêteur : .....

1ère ou 2ème fois qu'il s'entretient avec le sujet ? ( ) 1ère ( ) 2ème

Nom du codeur : .....

IDENTITE

(B) 1

1. Village : .....
2. ( ) TV ( ) non TV
3. Région : .....
4. Sous-préfecture : .....
5. Nom du quartier : .....
6. Nom du chef de quartier : .....
7. Nom du chef de cour : .....
8. Nom et prénom de l'enquêté : .....
9. Questionnaire numéro :

( ) 2

(, , , ,) 3 7

10. Sexe ( ) homme ( ) femme
11. Age ( ) de 15 à 25 ans
( ) de 26 à 45 ans
( ) plus de 45 ans
12. Ethnie : .....
13. L'enquêté est-il absent ? ( ) non ( ) oui
14. Si OUI, motif : .....
.....

15. Club ou association

Membre d'un groupe de jeunes et/ou d'un mouvement de coopérative, GVC ( ) non ( ) oui (/ 8)

16. Activité professionnelle principale

( ) planteur - cultivateur (production pour la vente)
( ) cultivateur (production pour auto-consommation)
( ) ménagère
( ) manoeuvre, ouvrier, chauffeur, petit commerçant
( ) fonctionnaire, commis, agent de terrain
( ) transporteur
( ) artisan (tailleur, menuisier, sculpteur, potier...)
( ) (gros) commerçant
( ) sans emploi

17. Revenu annuel

	Superficies en ha	Encadrement par Agents	Poids	Apport Financier
Café				
Cacao				
Riz				
Coton				
Tubercule				
Banane				
Céréales				
Arachide				
Légumes				
Elevage				
Autres types de revenu :				
			Total	

(/ 9)

18. Nombre de personnes à charge, y compris l'enquêté ? (__) 10

..... personnes

19. Revenu moyen par tête

Total (question 17) divisé par le nombre de personnes à charge (question 18) ..... (__) 11

ELEVAGE

20. Est-ce que vous avez des animaux (poulets, cabris, moutons, boeufs, etc?) ( ) non ( ) oui (__) 12

21. Est-ce que vous aviez des animaux au mois de janvier lorsque notre équipe est passée par ici ?

( ) non ( ) oui

22. Si les réponses aux questions 20 et 21 ne sont pas les mêmes, demandez la raison du changement .....
.....
.....
.....

23. Pour votre élevage, êtes-vous encadré par un agent de la SODEPRA ? (__) 13

( ) non ( ) oui

24. Si NON, pourquoi ne pratiquez-vous pas l'élevage moderne ?

( ) manque de moyens
( ) pas de vocation
( ) trop fatiguant
( ) pas assez lucratif (__) 14
( ) pas d'encadrement
( ) pas de main d'oeuvres
( ) autre :.....
( ) ne sait pas

(Consigne : Si OUI, se reporter à la fin du questionnaire, à la partie intitulée "Pour les encadrés SODEPRA

INITIATIVES

25. Dans votre cas, qui prend l'initiative de la réalisation des projets suivants ?

25A. Construction d'une maison ( ) vous-même ( ) parents ( ) conjoint ( ) autre ..... (___) 15

25B. Elevage moderne ( ) vous-même ( ) parents ( ) conjoint ( ) autre ..... (___) 16

25C. Création d'une plantation ( ) vous-même ( ) parents ( ) conjoint ( ) autre ..... (___) 17

25D. Création de ccopérative ( ) vous-même ( ) parents ( ) conjoint ( ) autre ..... (___) 18

26. Quel projet pouvez-vous réaliser tout seul ? ..... (___) 19
.....
.....

TELEVISION

27. Suivez-vous des émissions à la télé depuis janvier 77 ? (___) 20

( ) non ( ) oui

28. Si NON, pourquoi ?

( ) je n'aime pas la TV
( ) je n'ai pas le temps
( ) problèmes avec un ou les maîtres
( ) autre : .....

(___)
21

(Consigne : fin du questionnaire pour ceux qui ont répondu NON à la question 27, sauf pour ceux qui sont encadrés par la SODEPRA)

29. Si OUI, est-ce que depuis janvier 77 vous suivez les émissions très souvent, de temps en temps, ou presque jamais ?

( ) très souvent
( ) de temps en temps
( ) presque jamais

(___)
22

30. Où suivez-vous les émissions télévisuelles ?

( ) à l'école
( ) chez vous
( ) chez quelqu'un d'autre

31. Si vous suivez les émissions à l'école, quels jours y allez-vous ?

( ) lundi
( ) mardi
( ) mercredi
( ) jeudi
( ) vendredi
( ) samedi
( ) dimanche
( ) selon l'événement (match, etc.)

(___)
23

32. Quelles sortes d'émissions regardez-vous ?

( ) TPT seulement
( ) TPT et RTI Nationale
( ) RTI seulement
( ) ne sait pas

(___)
24

33. Depuis janvier 1977, la télé a traité plusieurs sujets. Est-ce que vous vous souvenez d'avoir vu des émissions sur .....

Elevage	( ) non ( ) oui ( ) nsp	( ) 25
SIKATIO	( ) non ( ) oui ( ) nsp	( ) 26
Education des jeunes	( ) non ( ) oui ( ) nsp	( ) 27
Habitat	( ) non ( ) oui ( ) nsp	( ) 28
Artisans, artistes	( ) non ( ) oui ( ) nsp	( ) 29
Eau filtrée	( ) non ( ) oui ( ) nsp	( ) 30
Epargne(Tianlo, SNDA)	( ) non ( ) oui ( ) nsp	( ) 31
Réponses aux questions	( ) non ( ) oui ( ) nsp	( ) 32
Bilan et souhaits (reportage sur publics TPT)	( ) non ( ) oui ( ) nsp	( ) 33

(Consigne : si l'enquêté n'a vue aucune de ces émissions, c'est la fin du questionnaire, sauf pour ceux qui sont encadrés par la SODEPRA)

34. Quels soirs sont passées ces émissions-là ? ..... ( ) 34
.....

35. Depuis janvier, que se passe-t-il immédiatement après ces émissions ?

( ) animation ( ) 35
( ) on regarde l'émission suivante
( ) on va à la maison
( ) autre : .....

36. S'il y a de l'animation, prenez-vous la parole pendant ces discussions : très souvent, quelquefois, ou jamais ? (___) 36

( ) très souvent
( ) quelquefois
( ) jamais

37. Depuis janvier 1977, est-ce que ces émissions vous ont incité à prendre des décisions ? ( ) non ( ) oui (___) 37

38. Si OUI, qu'est-ce que vous avez décidé de faire ? ..... (___) 38
.....
.....

39. Qu'est-ce que vous avez déjà fait ? ..... (___) 39
.....
.....

40. Qu'est-ce que vous n'avez pas (encore) pu réaliser ? ..... (___) 40
.....
.....

41. Pourquoi ? (___) 41

( ) manque de moyens financiers
( ) les vieux font obstruction
( ) manque d'encadrement
( ) autre : .....

42. Quel est le problème principal de votre village ? (___) 42

( ) eau
( ) argent
( ) santé
( ) habitat
( ) terrain de culture
( ) route
( ) véhicule
( ) autre : .....

43. Ce problème a-t-il été abordé à la Télé ? (___) 43

( ) non ( ) oui

44. Y-a-t-il d'autres problèmes cruciaux du village qui n'aient pas été abordés à la Télé ? ( ) non ( ) oui

45. Si OUI, lesquels ?

1. ..... (___) 44

2. ..... (___) 45

3. ..... (___) 46

(Consigne : Pour ceux qui ont répondu à la question 33 qu'ils ont vu des émissions sur l'élevage et/ou SIKATIO, posez les questions suivantes).

46. De quels animaux a-t-on parlé dans les émissions sur l'élevage ? (___) 47

( ) poulet
( ) porc
( ) mouton
( ) boeufs
( ) autre : .....
( ) ne sait pas

47. Donnez un conseil pour chaque espèce citée dans la question précédente. (___) 48

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

48. Pour chaque conseil que vous avez cité, donnez des précisions
.....
.....
.....
.....

49. Est-ce que les conseils donnés à la Télé sur l'élevage suffisent pour entreprendre un élevage moderne ? ( ) non ( ) oui (___) 49

50. Si NON, que faut-il de plus ? ..... (___) 50
.....
.....

51. Quelles sont les démarches à faire dans le village et hors du village pour être encadré par un agent de la SODEPRA ?

dans le village : ..... (___) 51
.....

hors du village :..... (___) 52
.....

SIKATIO

52. Avez-vous vu un ou plusieurs épisodes de SIKATIO, le feuilleton hebdomadaire de TPT, présenté le vendredi soir ?

( ) non
( ) oui, plusieurs épisodes (___) 53
( ) oui, un épisode

(Consigne : Si la réponse est oui, continuez. Si le sujet n'est pas sûr ou dit qu'il ne sait pas, creuser la question; continuer seulement si le sujet est au courant du feuilleton).

APPENDIX C

Broadcasting dates and titles of TPT series on animal husbandry

Date	Title	
12/3/76	Hog raising	
12/17/76	Sheep raising	
1/7/77	Chicken raising	
1/26/77	Livestock raising in the Ivory Coast	)
2/2/77	Construction of a pen or corral	) "experimental
2/4/77	Chicken raising (repeat)	) treatment"
2/9/77	Treatment of the animals	)
5/18/77	Marketing of cattle	
6/22/77	Marketing of cattle (repeat)	

APPENDIX D

LIST OF VILLAGES INCLUDED IN THE SAMPLE

Villages without a TV school in January 1977*

Village	Department	Sub-prefecture	Primary school inspectorate	Population M	Population F	Population Total	Distance in kms. to nearest town	Accessibility	Region
Bougousso	Odienné	Bako	Odienné	462	517	979	50	difficult	savanna
Foula	Touba	Touba	Touba	93	104	197	30	difficult	savanna
Niempurgué	Boundiali	Boundiali	Boundiali	633	627	1260	60	difficult	savanna
Paabénéfla	Bouaflé	Sinfra	Bouaflé	249	235	484	15	medium	forest
Timbo	Bouaké	Prikro	M'Bahiakro	435	400	835	40	difficult	wooded savanna
Yézimala	Bondoukou	Bondoukou	Bondoukou	491	476	967	33	easy	wooded savanna

* (Paabénéfla had a TV school in April 1977)

Villages with a TV school in January 1977

Bibikoréfla	Bouaflé	Gohitafla	Zuénoula	281	292	573	20	?	wooded savanna
Bouapé	Adzopé	Adzopé	Adzopé	1157	1038	2195	17	easy	forest
Dioman	Touba	Touba	Touba	265	325	590	30	difficult	savanna
Foula	Odienné	Bako	Odienné	555	559	1114	45	difficult	savanna

Groumania	Bouaké	Prikro	M'Bahaiakro	391	377	768	36	easy	wooded savanna
Kandopleu	Man	Biankouma	Man	595	664	1277	25	easy	forest
Kébi	Boundiali	Boundiali	Boundiali	726	783	1509	45	medium	savanna
Kongoti	Bouaké	M'Bahiakro	M'Bahiakro	338	359	697	15	easy	forest
Kouaméziankro	Abengourou	Abengourou	Abengourou	446	403	849	20	medium	forest
Koumoudji	Bouaflé	Sinfra	Bouaflé	625	674	1299	30	easy	forest
Niénankaha	Katiola	Katiola	Katiola	1006	1084	2090	10	easy	wooded savanna
N'Zéré	Bouaké	Yamoussoukro	Yamoussoukro	546	528	1074	31	easy	wooded savanna
Sapia	Daloa	Daloa	Daloa I	208	240	448	5	easy	forest
Siolokaha	Korhogo	Napiéoledougou	Korhogo II	458	463	921	80	difficult	savanna
Tiaha	Abidjan	Dabou	Dabou	509	540	1049	20	medium	forest
Torosanguéhi	Bondoukou	Bondoukou	Bondoukou	801	765	1566	54	difficult	wooded savanna

Appendix D - 2

235

THE PRESENCE OF INFRASTRUCTURAL INNOVATIONS IN THE 22 SAMPLE VILLAGES

	16 TV villages (N = 16 = 100%)						6 Non-TV villages (N = 6 = 100%)						All 22 villages (N = 22 = 100%)					
	Absent		Present		Under construction		Absent		Present		Under Construction		Absent		Present		Under Construction	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Well	7	44	7	44	2	13	2	33	3	50	1	17	9	41	10	45	3	14
Water tower	15	94	--	--	1	6	6	100	-	--	-	--	21	95	-	--	1	5
Dam	15	94	1	6	--	--	6	100	-	--	-	--	21	95	1	5	-	--
School	--	--	16	100	--	--	1	17	5	83	-	--	1	5	21	95	-	--
Dispensary	15	94	1	6	--	--	5	83	-	--	1	17	20	91	1	5	1	5
Maternity	16	100	--	--	--	--	6	100	-	--	-	--	22	100	-	--	-	--
Electricity	12	75	3	19	1	6	6	100	-	--	-	--	18	82	3	14	1	5
Rezoning	9	56	4	25	3	19	4	67	2	33	-	--	13	59	6	27	3	14
Covered market	16	100	--	--	--	--	5	83	1	17	-	--	21	95	1	5	-	--
Youth center	15	94	1	6	--	--	6	100	-	--	-	--	21	95	1	5	-	--
Cooperative	8	50	7	44	1	6	2	33	2	33	2	33	10	45	9	41	3	14

APPENDIX F

The initiators and financers of infrastructural innovations

in TV and non-TV villages

		TV villages		Non-TV villages		Total	
		Initiator	Financer	Initiator	Financer	Initiator	Financer
Well	g	2	5	2	1	4	6
	v	7	1	-	1	7	2
	g + v	-	3	1	1	1	4
Watertower	v	1	-	-	-	1	-
	g + v	-	1	-	-	-	1
Dam	g	1	1	-	-	1	1
School	g	3	5	-	1	3	6
	v	11	9	5	3	16	12
	g + v	-	1	-	1	-	2
Dispensary	g	-	1	-	-	-	1
	v	1	-	-	-	1	-
	g + v	-		-	1	-	1
Electricity	g	2	2	-	-	2	2
Rezoning	g	2	1	-	-	2	1
	v	3	4	1	1	4	5
Cooperative	g	3	-	-	-	3	-
	v	4	(5)	2	-	6	(5)
Total	g	13	15	2	2	15	17
	v	27	14 (19)	8	5	35	19 (24)
	g + v	--	5	1	3	1	3

Legend: g government administration

(Continued)

v village council, individual villagers or village intellectuals

g + v government and village

* There are discrepancies between the number of initiators and the number of financers. This as well as the fact that we do not have information about the initiating and financing of all innovations reflect the difficulty for village chiefs to recall how certain village improvements were made.

APPENDIX G

The most urgent development problems in the 22 sample villages

	16 TV villages (N = 16 = 100%)		6 Non-TV villages (N = 6 = 100%)		All 22 villages (N = 22 = 100%)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Maternity	2	13	1	17	3	14
Dispensary	9	56	5	83	14	64
Water	5	31	5	83	10	45
Roads & bridges	4	25	3	50	7	32
Rezoning	4	25	1	17	55	23
Village improvement	1	6	-	--	11	5
School completion and extension	3	19	1	17	4	18
Becoming a Sub-Prefecture	2	13	-	--	2	9
Agricultural mechanization	1	6	-	--	1	5
No store	1	6	-	--	1	5
No covered marketplace	1	6	-	--	1	5
No youth center	1	6	-	--	1	5
No cooperative	1	6	1	17	2	9
Want extension cord for TV receiver for TPT	1	6	—	--	1	5
Total	36		17		53	

APPENDIX H

Total number and kind of field agents in the 22 sample villages

	16 TV Villages (N = 16 = 100%)		6 Non-TV Villages (N = 6 = 100%)		All 22 Villages (N = 22 = 100%)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Health agents or agents of the "Grandes Endemies"	5	31	3	50	8	36
CIDT*	4	25	3	50	7	32
SODEPRA	4	25	2	33	6	27
SATMACI	4	25	1	17	5	23
SODERIZ	3	19	2	33	5	23
ONPR	1	6	2	33	3	14
Agriculture	3	19	-	--	3	14
CAITACI	2	13	-	--	2	9
Animal traction	-	--	1	--	1	5
SODEPALM	1	16	-	--	1	5
Number of field agents per village						
No Agent	3	19	1	17	4	18
1 agent	5	31	-	--	5	23
2 agents	3	19	3	50	6	27
3 agents	5	25	-	--	4	18
4 agents	-	--	-	--	-	--
5 agents	-	--	1	17	1	5
6 agents	1	6	1	17	2	9
Total	16	100	6	100	22	100

* Identification of these agencies is given in Appendix L.

APPENDIX I

Distribution of ethnic groups in the sample villages

	Akan	Bété	Dan	Lagoon	Mandé	Sénoufo	Voltaian
Non-TV villages							
Bougousso					100%		
Fouala					100%		
Niempurgué						100%	
Paabénéfla			86%				
Timbo	100%						
Yézimala						100%	
TV Villages							
Bibikoréfla			100%				
Bouapé				100%			
Dioman					97%		
Foula					100%		
Groumania	63%				27%		
Kandopleu			90%				
Kébi					10%	87%	
Kongoti	80%						10%
Kouaméziankro			90%		5%		
Niénankaha					10%	83%	
N'Zéré	90%						
Sapia		90%					
Siolakaha						100%	
Tiaha				100%			
Torosanguéhi						93%	

APPENDIX J

List of main village development problems as perceived by the individual respondents (Question 42, April)

	N
Water problems	
Water in general	35
Construction of a second public well	1
Construction of a first public well	1
Drainage	2
Health problems	
Health in general	39
Construction of a dispensary	2
Housing problems	
Housing in general	33
Rezoning	4
House construction	3
Miscellaneous problems	
Lack of money	19
Lack of land	8
Becoming a Sous-Prefecture	3
Having a (TV) school	2
Having a cooperative	2
Problems between young and old	2
Problems with marriage	2

APPENDIX K

List of TPT Programs Broadcast in 1976-77

Date	Program title
10/6/77	The Spendthrift (Credit and savings series, rerun)
10/13/77	Waribana (Credit and savings series, rerun)
10/20/77	Tianlo (Credit and savings series, rerun)
10/27/77	Why not us? (Credit and savings series, rerun)
11/03/77	Choice of land
11/10/77	Cocoa tree nursery
11/17/77	No work
11/24/77	I want to be a worker
11/26/77	If I had known (Banking)
12/01/77	No idiot work
12/03/77	Hog raising
12/10/77	Your bicycle
12/15/77	Better to live in the village
1]/17/77	Sheep raising
12/22/77	Rose and Landry
01/05/77	Summing up and hopes for the future
01/07/77	Poultry raising
01/12/77	Cleanliness in the village
01/14/77	Artists - artisans - folklore
01/19/77	Rural housing : the roof
01/26/77	Animal raising in the Ivory Coast
01/28/77	Rural housing : the wall

02/02/77	Construction of an animal pen
02/04/77	Poultry raising (re-run)
02/09/77	Livestock care
02/11/77	Filtered water
02/18/77	Tianlo: the truth (re-run)
02/23/77	Getting drinkable water
03/04/77	Artisan in the village
03/09/77	Regrouping cooperatives
03/11/77	Answers to your questions (ONFP) (the primary teachers)
03/18/77	"Years 2, 3, 4" (BNDA, National Bank of Africa Development)
03/23/77	Education of youth 1
03/30/77	Education of youth 2 (students, parents and the school)
04/01/77	Sikatio: "You too, all mixed up"
04/08/77	Sikatio: "That is not dishonest"
04/13/77	Education of youth 3 (the good life and the lost years)
04/15/77	Sikatio: "Ah, so that's ABIDJAN"
04/20/77	A Series "Yao and Konan"
04/22/77	Sikatio: Caught redhanded at the port
04/27/77	SATMACI - planting
04/29/77	Sikatio: "Do we go or do we stay?"
05/04/77	Environment 1 (the forest in the Ivory Coast)
05/11/77	Environment 2 (a time of imbalances)
05/13/77	Answers to your questions
05/18/77	Animal raising (the marketing of beef)
05/20/77	Education of youth 4 (the child, the family and the city)
05/27/77	Pompo (a cultural film)

06/01/77	Environment 3: "What to do? What to propose?"
06/08/77	I want to be a worker (rerun)
06/15/77	River blindness (rerun)
06/22/77	Marketing of beef (rerun)
06/29/77	To the parents of first graders

APPENDIX L

List of Abbreviations

ACRI — Agent Chargé du Receuil d'Information (Pedagogical Counseler charged with collecting data and doing evaluation research for the Evaluation Service of the Ministry of Primary and TV Education).

CAITACI — Compagnie Africaine Industrielle du Tabac en Côte d'Ivoire (African Industrial Tobacco Company in the Ivory Coast)

CATEL — Compagnie Africaine de Télévision (African Television Company)

CIDT — Compagnie Ivoirienne du Développement des Fibres Textiles (Ivorian Company for the Development of Textile Fibers)

IIOP — Institut Ivoirien d'Opinion Publique (Ivorian Institute for Public Opinion Research).

ONPR — Office National de la Promotion Rural (National Office of Rural Promotion

OSTV — Out of School Educational Television Department of the Ministry of Primary and Television Education (Direction de l'Education Extra-Scolaire du Min. d'Education Primaire et de la Télévision Educative)

RTI — Radio Télévision Ivoirienne (Ivorian Radio and Television)

SATMACI — Compagnie d'Assistence Technique pour la Modernisation d'Agriculture en Côte d'Ivoire (Technical Assistance Company for the Modernization of Agriculture in the Ivory Coast)

SODEPRA — Societe d'Etat pour le Développement de la Production Animale (State Company for the Development of Animal Production)

SODERIZ — (Société d'Etat pour le Développement de la Riziculture (State

Company for the Development of Rice Cultivation)

TPT Télé pour Tous (Television for Everybody)

APPENDIX M

List of Research Reports Dealing With the Operation and Impact of the Télé Pour Tous Programs

1. Reports published under the auspices of the Evaluation Service of the Ministry of Primary and Television Education. Abidjan.

(Reports marked with an * were written under contract with the U.S. Agency for International Development.)

*Benveniste, Annie. L'Action d'Animation Entreprise pour Eucadrer la Reception du Programme d'Education Télévisuelle Extra-Scolaire en Côte d'Ivoire. Analyse des Résultats Observés dans Quartre Villages. 1976.

*Benveniste, Annie. The Reception and Animation of Out-of-School Educational Television Programs in the Ivory Coast: A Case Study of Four Villages. 1977. (English Summary of Benveniste, 1976).

Dörr, Volker. La Chaine du Production Télévisuelle de l'Extra-Scolaire. Calcul de Certains Moyens Nécessaires pour une Production de Base de 40 ou de 35 Emissions de 30 Minutes par An. 1975.

Fritz, Rüdiger. Le Public Atteint par Télé pour Tous. 1976.

*Grant, Stephen. Out-of-School TV in Four Villages. 1974.

*Grant, Stephen. An Administrative History of Out-of-School Educational Television in the Ivory Coast. 1977.

*Grant, Stephen and Seya, Pierre. Visits to Twenty-Three Villages to Determine the Impact of the Water Series Produced by the Out-of-School TV Department, November - December 1976.

*Kaye, Anthony and Lenglet, Frans. A Report on Out-of-School Television in the Ivory Coast before and during its First Operational Year, 1974-75. 1975.

*Klees, Steven. Cost Analysis of Non-Formal ETV Systems: A Case Study of the "Extra-Scolaire" System in the Ivory Coast. 1977.

Lenglet, Frans. Les Cellules Vidéo et Recherche pendant la Première Année Opérationelle de l'Education Extra-Scolaire, 1974-75. Une Evaluation des leurs Activités. 1975.

Lenglet, Frans. Rapport d'Evaluation du Stage pour les Animateurs Extra-Scolaires, Bouaké, 22-27 Septembre 1975. 1976.

Lenglet, Frans. Connaissance de la Carte de Côte d'Ivoire, 1976.

*Lenglet, Frans. The Impact of 25 Television Progams on "Water" Produced and Broadcast by the Ivorian Out-of-School Education Project. 1976.

*Lenglet, Frans and McAnany, Emile. Rural Adult Education and the Role of Mass Media: A Comparative Analysis of Four Projects. 1977.

*Seya, Pierre and Yao, Faustin. Television for the Rural African Village: Studies of Audiences and Impact in the Ivory Coast. 1977.

2. Internal Reports of the Evaluation Service

Seya, Pierre. La Collaboration entre l'Animateur Extra-Scolaire et les Agents de Terrain. 1976.

Yao, Faustin. Les Raisons de la Faible Participation des Villageois aux Emissions Télévisuelles Extra-Scolaires. 1976.

3. Reports published under the auspices of the Out-of-School Education Department of the Ministry of Primary and Television Education, Abidjan.

Ansellem, Joseph and Bouchet, Elisabeth. Reseaux d'Ecoute en Espace Urbain. Abidjan: Centre de Recherches Architecturales et Urbaines, 1975.

Bissiliat, Jeanne, Cambra, Gaétan, and Zeba Elie. Peut on Tester une Emissions Télévisuelle avec des Images Fixes? 1975.

Bissiliat, Jeanne, Jouët, Josiane, Lenglet, Frans, and Zeba, Elie. L'Expérimentation de Quatre Flashes Educatifs. 1975.

Bissiliat, Jeanne, Jouët, Josiane, Lenglet, Frans, and Zeba, Elie. Enquête sur la Compréhension de l'Affiche Eau, Filtre, Santé. 1975.

Bourgault, Louise. L'Ecoute des Citadins. Un Rapport sur l'Ecoute des Emissions Extra-Scolaire à Abidjan. 1975.

Colloque sur les Technologies de l'Education Extra-Scolaire du 7 an 12 Janvier 1974. 1974.

Jouët, Josiane. Rapport d'Enquete sur la Reception d'Emissions Extra-Scolaires dans l'AVB. 1975.

Jouët, Josiane. Rapport d'Enquête sur la Compréhension de l'Emissions et de l'Affiche sur le Ver de Guinée. 1976.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Benveniste, Annie. L'Action d'Animation Entreprise pour Encadrer la Reception du Programme d'Education Télévisuelle Extra-Scolaire en Côte d'Ivoire. Analyse des Résultats Observés dans Quatre Villages. Stanford: Institute for Communication Research, 1976.

Benveniste, Annie. The Reception and Animation of Out-of-School Educational Television Programs in the Ivory Coast: A Case Study of Four Villages. Stanford: Institute for Communication Research, Washington: Academy for Educational Development, 1977.

Bourgault, Louise. L'Ecoute des Citadins. Un Rapport sur l'écoute des Emissions Extra-Scolaires à Abidjan. Abidjan: Sous-Direction de l'Education Extra-Scolaire, 1975.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Cohen, Michael A. "Thy myth of the expanding centre - Politics in the Ivory Coast," Journal of Modern African Studies, II, ?, 1973: 227-246.

DATAR (Direction de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de l'Action Regionale). Untitled working documents. Abidjan: Ministère du Plan, 1975.

Eicher, Jean-Claude and Francois Orivel. Analyses des Coûts de l'Enseignement Primaire Télévisuel en Côte d'Ivoire. Abidjan: Service d'Evaluation/ Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1977.

Fritz, Ruediger. Le Public Atteint par Télé pour Tous. Abidjan, : Service d'Evaluation, 1976.

Goussault, Yves. "L'état et le développement de l'agriculture: le concept d'intervention," Revue Tiers-Monde, 17, 67, July-Sept. 1976 : 615-33.

Grant, Stephen. An Administrative History of Out-of-School Educational Television in the Ivory Coast. Abidjan: Service d'Evaluation/Washington, D.C. : Academy for Educational Development, 1977.

Grant, Stephen and Pierre T. Seya. Visits to Twenty-Three Villages to Determine the Impact of the Water Series Produced by the Out-of-School TV Department, November-December, 1975. Abidjan: Service d'Evaluation/ Washington, D.C. : Academy for Educational Development, 1976.

Hursh-César, Gerald and Prodipto Roy. Third World Surveys: Survey Research in Developing Nations. New Delhi: Macmillan, 1976.

IIOP. Population surveys (untitled). Abidjan: Institute Ivoirien d'Opinion Publique, n.d. (1975).

Ivory Coast Republic. La Télévision Educative au Service du Développement - L'Extra-Scolaire et "Télé Pour Tous". Abidjan: Sous-Direction de l'Education Extra-Scolaire, 1975.

Bibliographic References (Continued)

Ivory Coast Republic. Préparation au Comité Interministériel de Programmation de Télé pour Tous. Abidjan: Sous-Direction de l'Education Extra-Scolaire, 1976 a.

Ivory Coast Republic. La Côte d'Ivoire en Chiffres, 1976-77. Abidjan: Ministère du Plan, 1976 b.

Ivory Coast Republic. Alpha-Media. Vol. 7 of the Etudes Régionales prepared by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Abidjan: Ministère du Plan, 1976 c.

Jamison, Dean and Emile McAnany. Radio for Education and Development. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, forthcoming.

Jouët, Josiane. Rapport d'Enquête sur la Compréhension de l'Emission et de l'Affiche sur le Ver de Guinée. Abidjan: Sous-Direction de l'Education Extra-Scolaire, Cellule Recherche, 1976.

Kaye, Anthony and Frans Lenglet. A Report on Out-of-School Television in the Ivory Coast before and during its First Operational Year, 1974-1975. Abidjan, Service d'Evaluation, 1975.

Kearle, Bryant (ed.). Field Data Collection in the Social Sciences. Experiences in Africa and the Middle East. New York: Agricultural Development Council, 1976.

Klees, Steven J. Cost Analysis of Non-Formal ETV Systems: A Case Study of the "Extra-Scolaire" System in the Ivory Coast. Abidjan: Service d'Evaluation/Washington, D.C. : Academy for Educational Development, 1977.

Lenglet, Frans. The Impact of 25 Television Programs on "Water" Produced and Broadcast by the Ivorian Out-of-School Education Project. Abidjan: Service d'Evaluation/Washington, D.C. : Academy for Educational Development, 1976.

Lenglet, Frans. Out-of-School Educational Television in the Ivory Coast: Its Effectiveness in Rural Development. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, forthcoming.

Lenglet, Frans and Emile McAnany. Rural Adult Education and the Role of Mass Media: A Comparative Analysis of Four Projects. Stanford: Institute for Communication Research/Washington Academy for Educational Development, 1977.

Pala, Achola. The Role of African Women in Rural Development: Research Priorities. Nairobi: Institute for Development Studies. Discussion Paper No. 203, 1975.

Seya, Pierre T. and Faustin K. Yao. Television for the Rural African Village: Studies of Audiences and Impact in the Ivory Coast. Stanford: Institute for Communication Research, 1977.

Bibliographic References (Continued)

Stryker, Richard. Political and Administrative Linkage in the Ivory Coast. In: Foster, Philip and Zolberg, Aristide (eds.): Ghana and the Ivory Coast, Perspectives on Modernization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971: 73-102.

Yao, Faustin K. Les Causes de la Faible Participation des Villageois aux Emissions "Télé pour Tous". Abidjan: Service d'Evaluation (internal document), 1976.